40213

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Jana Maria LAMONT

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* VSEVOLOD IVANOV'S "BRONEPOEZD 14-69": A COMPARATIVE TEXTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ORIGINAL AND REVISED VERSIONS

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1978

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. R.L. Busch

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* September 28th SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Jana M. Lamont

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 14915 - 54A Street
EDMONTON / ALBERTA
T5A 2M8

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

VSEVOLOD IVANOV'S "BRONEPOEZD 14-69": A COMPARATIVE TEXTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ORIGINAL AND REVISED VERSIONS

by

(C) JANA M. LAMONT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Vsevolod Ivanov's "Bronepoezd 14-69": A Comparative Textological Analysis of the Original and Revised Versions

submitted by Jana M. Lamont

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

R. Busch
Supervisor

Date August 24, 1978

ABSTRACT

This is a textological study of Vsevolod Ivanov's Bronepoezd 14-69, a tale which belongs to the important works of early Soviet literature. Written originally in 1922, Bronepoezd 14-69 was, together with Partizany and Tsvetnye vetra, incorporated into the cycle Partizanskie povesti. A close look at the history of revision and publishing of Partizanskie povesti is revelatory not only with respect to numerous contextual changes which worked to the detriment of literary value of these tales, but also with respect to the problem of the Soviet regime's influence on belles-lettres. In the early 1930's, an official Soviet literary and artistic doctrine called Socialist Realism was introduced as the guide for the development of the creative arts. Under Socialist Realism a complex of rigid norms was applied to the creation of works of literature and to other art forms. For literature, the Soviet regime introduced an editing and censoring apparatus whose operations often had a significant retroactive effect on Soviet literary works, especially those written in the 1920's. These editing and censoring activities reached their peak in the 1940's and 1950's. The early works of important Soviet writers underwent extensive revisions which in some cases were done by the authors themselves. Among such works are Donskie rasskazy by M. Sholokhov, Razgrom by A. Fadeev, Peregnoi and Pravonarushiteli by L. Seifullina, Tsement by F. Gladkov, Vor by L. Leonov, and many others. Here belongs also the

tale Bronepoezd 14-69, to which Ivanov kept returning. His efforts resulted in several variations on this tale, and in significantly revised editions.

It is this tale, and specifically its 1922, 1934/1968 and 1954 editions that are analysed and evaluated in the course of this study. The study focuses on the examination of those ornamentalist stylistic markers of the 1920's used by Ivanov and many of the Serapion Brotherhood to which he belonged, e.g., ornamentalist tropes, naturalism and ostranenie. This is done by juxtaposing the original 1922 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 in which these literary devices appear, with revised versions from later period. The latter reflect the incursion of Socialist Realist criteria through the incorporation of a "positive hero" and political orthodoxy expressing the official "line" of the Communist Party at the expense of the tale's original stylistic richness and authorial impartiality. In the course of this thesis the changes found in the later versions of the tale are grouped in the following categories: characterization, ideological orthodoxy, and ornamentalism which involves naturalism, ornamentalist tropes, and ostranenie ("making it strange"). The study provides documents, classifies and interprets these changes, and orders them on the basis of increasing significance. The concluding part of this thesis is mainly concerned with the evaluation of the changes with respect to their overall effect on the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I:	VSEVOLOD IVANOV AND THE PROBLEM OF REVISIONS IN SOVIET LITERATURE	1
II:	BRONEPOEZD 14-69	19
III:	A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE 1922, 1954 AND 1968 VERSIONS OF "BRONEPOEZD 14-69"	39
IV:	EVALUATION OF CHANGES AND THEIR OVERALL EFFECT ON "BRONEPOEZD 14-69"	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY		103

CHAPTER I

VSEVOLOD IVANOV AND THE PROBLEM OF REVISIONS IN SOVIET LITERATURE

Western literary scholars have often commented upon the close ties between Soviet belles-lettres and the official "line" of the Communist Party whose political "values" often work to the detriment of literary value.[1] The problem of the Soviet regime's influence of belles-lettres is an extensive one, and this study shall examine only one of its aspects - the changes made in current editions of early Soviet prose. Both Western and Soviet scholarship recognize that later editions of early Soviet classics do not adequately render their original qualities.[2] This is so because the Soviet regime introduced an editing and censoring apparatus whose operation often had a significant retroactive effect on Soviet literary works, especially those written in the 1920's. This type of revision in Soviet literature is

---

[1] See M. Friedberg, "Soviet Literature and Retroactive Truth", Problems of Communism, 3(1954), pp. 31-39.
and M. Friedberg, "New Editions of Soviet Belles Lettres: A Study in Politics and Palimpsests", American Slavic and East European Review, 13(1954), pp. 72-88.
and P.M. Austin, "Further Surgery of Erenburg's 'Xulio Xurenito'", The Slavic and East European Journal, XI(1967), No. 2, pp. 204-208.
and G. Kern, "Solzhenicyn's Self-censorship: the Canonical Text of 'Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha'", The Slavic and East European Journal, 20(1976), No. 4, pp. 421-436.

[2] See L. N. Smirnova, "Kak sozdavalsia 'Tsement'", Tekstologiia proizvedenii sovetskoi literatury--voprosy tekstologii, Vypusk 4 (Moskva: Nauka, 1967), p. 225.
and V. Lakshin, "Ot rukopisi - k knige", Novyi Mir, No. 2(1969), pp. 247-252.

unfortunately, not a sporadic but a widespread phenomenon which reached its peak in the 1940's and 1950's. The early works of important Soviet writers underwent extensive revisions. This is so of Donskie rasskazy by M. Sholokhov, Razgrom by A. Fadeev, Bronepoezd 14-69 by Vs. Ivanov, Peregnoi and Pravonarushiteli by L. Seifullina, Tsement by F. Gladkov, Vor by L. Leonov and many others.[1]

V. Lakshin, in his article Ot rukopisi - k knige, expressed serious concern over the consequences of the editor's role with regard to some "classics" of Soviet literature.[2] In his opinion the role of editor did not necessarily have a negative effect, e.g., where the author and the editor - usually a young author and an experienced editor - worked hand in hand to achieve higher quality.[3] Unfortunately this was not the case with the majority of revised Soviet classics. As an important illustration of the negative effects of Soviet editing, Lakshin cites the letter of Maksim Gorky to Vsevolod Ivanov in which Gorky protested:

> -- O tiranii redaktorov, a takzhe o malogramotnosti onykh - napishu stateiku, material est', no bude Vy tozhe imeete onyi, - davaite mne. [4]

---

[1] In her article Kak sozdavalsiia 'Tsement', L. N. Smirnova claims that almost every single Soviet literary work created in the 1920's, was revised or rewritten by its author. Op. cit., p. 225.

[2] See V. Lakshin, "Ot rukopisi - k knige", pp. 247-252.

[3] An example of such "positive" editing (correction) is the first edition of D. Furmanov's Chapaev where the young author was helped significantly by a veteran editor P. Lepeshinsky. Ibid., p. 247.

[4] Ibid., p. 249.

Unfortunately, Gorky's death interrupted materialization of the intended article. The line between the "positive" and the "negative" revision of a literary work is crossed when artistic criteria cease to be uppermost for either an editor or author. As an example of a negative revision based on the imposition of the editor's will and poor taste Lakshin refers to the 1952 edition of N. Ostrovsky's novel Kak zakalialis' stal'.[1] Therein three hundred textual changes were made, some of a narrowly stylistic type, others of an ideological nature. Of these, Lakshin maintains, a contemporary textologist would justify approximately ten.

However, it is not always the editor who was responsible for low quality revisions. Many cases are known where Soviet authors themselves decided to revise their works for several reasons. The specifics of such changes will be discussed in detail further on. For the present, F. Gladkov's novel Tsement (1925) can serve as a general example. In this instance the writer, over a period of some thirty years, kept coming back to the text of his novel revising and rewriting it so that the original text of the novel was radically changed. It is now made up of layer upon

---

[1] See V. Lakshin, "Ot rukopisi - k knige", p. 250.

layer of stylistic and contextual revisions.[1]

Gladkov's novel is generally indicative of the type of revision where literary activity succumbs to the desire of the author to make his work conform to subsequent social, moral and politico-ideological standards. Most often this represented an attempt to adapt the work to criteria of Socialist Realism.

> Dni goreli ne solntsem: nebo bylo v ovchinku, a dlia grudi ne khvatalo vozdukha, i gorod, i gory, i liudi, i pristani khlestali vertrom v glaza i kuvyrkalis' v kamennykh vikhrakh.
>
> Tol'ko v serdtse trepykhalis' dni, i serdtse bilos' polotnom kumacha. S zadrannym shlemom begal Gleb v Sovprof, v Partkom (nemedlenno sozvat' obshchegorodskoe partiinoe sobranie!), v Uchprofsozh (tovarishchi, tolkaite podachu cistern k nefteperegonu!), v zavodoupravlenie, v mashinnye korpusa zavoda - tam Brynza, tam dizelia, gotovye k rabote.
>
> Zhidkii khvatal vozdukh nozdriami i srazmakhu shlepal ego po spine. [2]

Compare now the identical passage as it appears in the 1967 edition of Tsement:

> Dni goreli solntsem i znoem i nasyshcheny byli khlopotami, delami, goriachkoi, a nochi kak-to ne zapominalis'. Oblivaias' potom, begal Gleb v sovprof, v okruzhkom (nemedlenno sozvat' obshchegorodskoe partiinoe sobranie!),

---

[1] By "contextual" is meant that revision which, apart from straightforward grammatical corrections and formal editing involved substantial modifications in the content of literary works. Examples of this would be where characters were significantly altered and whole passages or chapters were incorporated or deleted, thus bringing about extensive semantic changes in the works concerned.

[2] F. Gladkov, "Tsement", Krasnaia Nov', 1925, no. 4, p. 53

Note: The underlined are passages deleted from the 1967 edition.

> v uchprofsozh (tovarishchi, tolkaite podachu cistern k nefteperegonu!), v zavodoupravlenie, v mashinnye korpusa zavoda - tam Brynza, tam dizelia, gotovye k rabote... [1]

Even this single example demonstrates the extent of the revision which impoverished the language and style of the work removing its former originality.

Among literary works that underwent significant editing, is the novel Vor by Leonid Leonov. An extensive revision of Vor (1927) was done in the 1950's. The original novel was a fine literary work noted for its rich language and unusual narrative structure. These together with Dostoievskian characterization technique and overall rich verbal texture, made this novel one of the foremost works of Soviet prose in the 1920's.

The following examples will show how the revision affected the stylistic richness of the original.

> Zhguchaia prelest' neznakomki khlestnula ego po glazam, i on uzhe ne soprotivlialsia svoemu pleneniiu, vnezapnomu, kak neschastie. Ego litso pomutnelo, dykhanie zaderzhalos', serdtse razverzlos', kak propast', pogloshchaiushchaia letiashchii kamen'. [2]

The identical passage in the 1970 edition appears as follows:

> Zhguchaia prelest' neznakomki khlestnula ego po glazam, i vot on ne soprotivlialsia svoemu

---

[1] F. Gladkov, Tsement (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967) p. 123.

[2] L. Leonov, Vor (Moskva: Gosizdat, 1928) p. 12.

> pleneniiu, vnezapnomu, kak vsiakoe neschastie. [1]

or

> Nastoiashchego ne vidim my mira, a vidim rukami sdelanyi, a ruki strashnee vsego. Byvaiut oni lipkie i dlinnye, mokhnatye i krivye, skotskie i tiranskie, i vsiakie inoiu skvernoi ispachkanye ruki. [2]
>
> Okrome zvezd v nebe, nastoiashchego-to pochti i ne vidim my mira, vse bolshe vidim rukami sdelanyi, a chego oni kosnutsia, liudskie zhadnye ruki, to i obrecheno byvaet nesytomu i smertnomu pokoiu. [3]

From the above passages it can be seen that the simplification of the style of Vor tended to remove the special flavour and spirit of the depicted era and particularly ornamentalism, a major stylistic marker of the given literary period.

Works which underwent such revisions risked suffering a loss of originality and spontaneity. The behaviour of their characters can become artificial as a result of the break in the organic unity between the hero of a given novel and the period being depicted. As examples of such negative change in characters one can cite Dasha in F. Gladkov's Tsement as well as Znobov and certain partisans in Vs. Ivanov's Bronepoezd 14-69.

For the purposes of this thesis it is important to

---

[1] L. Leonov, Vor (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1970) p. 16.
[2] L. Leonov, Vor, 1928, p. 14.
[3] L. Leonov, Vor, 1970, p. 17.

clarify what is meant by the term ornamentalism, for ornamental prose displayed various aspects. In her article Ornamentalism and Modernism, Patricia Garden defines ornamentalism as follows:

> Ornamentalism was characterized as a style by its verbal hijinks. Various writers emphasize one or another quality of verbal play, some stressing the use of archaisms, colloquialisms, dialect, and different levels of diction, others stressing puns, neologisms, word play, and nonsense language. All shared the tendency to use words as motifs in an ornamental pattern, combining phrases repetitively, even hypnotically. [1]

In short, it may be said that the principal quality of ornamental prose, is the predominance of its form over the plot. As noted by Viktor Shklovsky in his essay Ornamental'naia proza, Vsevolod Ivanov developed his own variant of ornamentalism.[2] It may be pointed out that ornamentalism in the materials under examination appears in several forms ranging from naturalist expressions, fanciful tropes, ostranenie ("making it strange") to stikhiinost' (spontaneity). These subcategories of ornamentalism may be defined further as follows:

Ornamentalist tropes in Bronepoezd 14-69 and in other works by Ivanov written in the early 1920's appear in the form of vivid epithets and extraordinary similes which express the writer's special emphasis on bringing out

---

[1] P. Garden, "Ornamentalism and Modernism", Russian Modernism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), p. 50.
[2] V. Shklovsky, "Ornamental'naia proza", O teorii prozy (Moskva: Federatsiia, 1929), p. 216.

qualities characteristic of persons and ascribing them to things and vice versa. In some cases ornamentalist tropes acquire a grotesque quality, as the following examples show:

> Nezelasov byl shirokii, no ploskii chelovek, pokhozhii na list bumagi: sboku - nitka, v grudi - versta...
> ... byl on uzkoglazyi, s vydaiushchimisia skulami, pokhozhimi na oblomki rzhanogo sukharia. [1]

The naturalist aspect of ornamentalism may be seen in Ivanov's observation and description of setting, characters and situations without avoiding what may be regarded as repulsive:

> Pakhlo iz teplushek bol'nym potom, pelenkami i podle vagonov gusto pakhli ammiakom rastoptannye isprazhneniia. [2]

or

> Zasypali my togda mogilu - sneg s peskom, Trupy ot vesny oseli, potom vzbukhli, zemlia lopnula - i smradnoe gnienie oblepilo gorod. Sazhen za sto nel'zia bylo pod"ekhat' k mogile. Krest skatilsia, seraia gnoinaia zhizha tekla iz zhelto-chernoi scheli. [3]

Ostranenie ("making it strange") in Ivanov's works may be identified in the narrative exposition that presents things, characters and episodes in a strange, unexpected way bringing an essence of unfamiliarity to the story.

> Razyskivaia v parovoznom instrumente zubilo,

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", Krasnaia Nov', No. 1 (1922), p. 75.
[2] Ibid., p. 77.
[3] V. Ivanov, "Kak sozdaiutsia kurgany", A Bilingual Collection of Russian Short Stories Vol. II (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 340.

uzkogorlyi zashib golovu i vdrug ne ot boli zakrichal. [1]

This form of ostranenie corresponds to the definition and usage of this literary device by the Russian formalists.[2] However, there are other ways to achieve the effect of "making it strange". In Bronepoezd 14-69, this literary device may also be observed in fragmentation of the plot and action into series of unmotivated episodes.

Stikhiinost' (Spontaneity) in the materials under examination stands out as a behavioral quality of Ivanov's peasant partisans. Their unpredictable deeds and actions, that are inspired by momentary feelings, are given prominence through a special lyrical depiction.

Odin v krasnol rubakhe kulakom grozit:
- My tebe pokazhem!
Komu, kto?
Neizvestno!
A grozit' vsegda nado!
Krasnaia rubakha, kak krasnyi bant na seroi shineli.
Bant! [3]

Already by the late 1920's and early 1930's Soviet writers, such as Vs. Ivanov, not only revised their works but they themselves underwent a radical change in their literary evolution. This change was of course noted by critics.

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", p. 111.
[2] V. Erlich, Russian Formalism (The Hague: Mouton, 1955), p. 150.
[3] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", p. 119.

After studying other works by Ivanov, one is able to observe that his style of the late 1920's contrasts sharply with that of the early 1920's which was the zenith of ornamentalism in Soviet narrative prose. Certainly in this early period Ivanov's writing is characterized by its lyrical, ornamental quality. Ivanov's works sparkled with rich colours and sounds. Strong emotions were manifested both by narrator and characters. Man was depicted as but a part or detail in a picturesque naturalistic complex.

However, later in the 1920's Ivanov's style becomes less and less ornamental.[1] He turns increasingly to ideologically "safe", simple themes.

The characters appearing in Ivanov's later stories are no longer portrayed as an organic part of nature. Narrative exposition increases markedly, and therein simple words and syntax replace many of the former ornamental features. Another observable feature of Ivanov's new style is the changing role of the narrator figure. In his earlier works the narrator figure appears frequently in the form of the "personalized narrator".[2] In the late 1920's the narrator becomes "detached", i.e., completely separated from the

---

[1] Cf. A. Lezhnev, "Vsevolod Ivanov", Literaturnye budni (Moskva: Federatsiia, 1929), pp. 270-274.
and G. Struve, Soviet Russian Literature 1917-50 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951), pp. 61-62.

[2] Usually a first person narrator who plays an active role in the plot of the narrative (e.g., Kak sozdaiutsia kurgany, 1922).

characters figuring in the context, e.g., Litera T (1927). Moreover, the deornamentalized speech of the narrator in the later works acquires predominance at the expense of character speech per se. While in Kak sozdiautsia kurgany (1922) the dialogues constituted approximately thirty per cent, in the later story Litera T they constituted less than ten per cent of the total text.

The simplification of the narrative structure and the absence of those literary devices which were characteristic of Ivanov's early period obviously does not require as much artistic and intellectual effort on the author's side as his earlier works did. The resulting work is not so rich, witty and engrossing as his previous works were. The later works lost not only their ornamentalism but also their joyfullness and sincerity.

The discussion concerning changes in Ivanov's narrative structure and themes can be concluded by juxtaposing two passages from the early and late 1920's.

> Golos u sekretaria byl tochnyi, telegrafnyi. Byl on v valenkakh i rvanoi shineli s zashtopannym vorotnikom. Samyn chistym na nem byl revol'ver.
> - Chto zh imeet predlozhit' gubispolkom? sprosil ia.
> - Gubispolkom daet vam, tovarishch Ivanov, neogranichennye polnomochiia na Tatskii uezd, trekh podryvnikov, dinamit, sekretaria i mashinistku, a takzhe otdelnyi vagon. Poezzhaite i khoronite.
> - A esli nachnut razlagat'sia?
> - Nu i chto zh, tovarishch.
> - Na takoi predmet nado spirtu. Mne tiazhelo. Zapakh.
> Sekretar' zadushevnym tenorkom protianul:

> - Esli zapakh - mozhno. Tol'ko ty tam ne briakai na vidu...
> Poezzhai, kakogo cherta ty sharashishsia, pisatel'!
> Tebe vse videt' nado.
> - Razve otkazyvaius', - otvetil ia. - Vagon davaite. [1]

Compare now with the passage from Litera T:

> Ivan Semenych Pankratov Liubil povtoriat', chto i umret-to on, stoia za realom, i chto trup ego vynesut iz tipografii, kak bukvu vynimaiut iz nabora: lbom k stenam, a ne k potolku. Priateli po rabote uvazhali ego za etu bezzabotnost', bodrost', veseluiu sedinu i za te piat' morshchin, kotorye, kak shramy, peresekali ego rozovoe litso i govorili, chto chelovek s takimi morshchinami videl mnogo vetrov i mnogo solntsa.
>
> Davno uzh Ivan Semenych stal zamechat', chto zrenie ego slabnet, mir tuskneet: izchezaiut veselye oblaka, rano nastupaet seryi vecher. S tablichnogo nabora ego pereveli na afishi, no on delal mnogo oshibok. Pered nim izvinilis', poruchili emu razdavat' originaly i razbirat'. No i tut Ivan Semenych ne upal dukhcm, on tol'ko zaiavil, chto, vidno, ot starosti ruki triasutsia, a pro glaza umolchal. [2]

By comparing these two passages one is able to observe several major differences in Ivanov's literary development. The change in the narrator figure is obvious: while in Kak sozdaiutsia kurgany the narrator is "personalized", in Litera T the narrator is "detached".

These examples also demonstrate the difference in

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Kak sozdaiutsia kurgany", A Bilingual Collection of Russian Short Stories Vol. II (New York: Random House, 1965) pp. 326, 328.

[2] V. Ivanov, "Litera T", Sobranie sochinenii Vol. III (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958), p. 477.

vividness, thematic originality, directness and the quality of narrative structure. Besides all these features the early story displays lively dialogue composed of well chosen expressions while the later story demonstrates simplicity, monotony of the narrative structure as well as an ideologically "safe" theme.

- - -

Among the first important works of early Soviet literature to become popular not only at home but abroad were Ivanov's Partizanskie povesti. However, as Lakshin noted, the reader who becomes familiar with them through reading editions from the 1940's or 1950's, should be aware of the fact that these are not the same works that were the centre of interest and discussion in the 1920's.[1] Only in remote, old journals containing the original publications does there survive the genuine inspiration and essence of the style of that time. A close look at the history of revision and publishing of Partizanskie povesti is revelatory not only with respect to their author, but also to numerous other works from that period.

The cycle Partizanskie povesti belongs to the early period of the 1920's (1921-1923) and contains three tales: Partizany, Bronepoezd 14-69, and Tsvetnye vetra. This period includes a number of distinctive ideational and esthetic

---

[1] V. Lakshin, "Ot rukopisi - k knige", Novyi Mir, No. 2 (1969), p. 251.

markers and thus constitutes a clearly definable stage in Ivanov's creative development. The auther himself in his speech to the Third Congress of Soviet Writers, remarks:

> Mne kazalos', chto vidennyi nami, perezhityi nami epos Oktiabria i grazhdanskoi voiny mozhnc izobrazit' lish' obraznym, metaforicheskim, vozvyshennym slogom, a ritm knig dolzhen byt' stremitel'nym, obryvistym, v naibolee pafosnykh mestakh perekhodia v stikhctvorenie bez rifm.
>
> Tak byli mnoiu napisany Partizanskie povesti, tol'ko tak, kazalos' mne, mozhno bylo rasskazat' o nedavnikh bitvakh, o krovi i pyli bolshikh dorog, o schast'e i gore bor'by za zemliu, za sotsializm, za mir! [1]

For the most part readers and critics of the period found Ivanov's style highly praiseworthy.[2] Some others criticised Ivanov for the spontaneity which he imparted to the characters of his peasant partisans who predominated as actants in his stories. This point of view was expressed by A. Neverov who remarked:

> Vsevolod Ivanov idet ne ot idei revoliutsii, a ot muzhitskoi neliubvi k nachalstvu.... [3]

The point of view expressed by Neverov later provided the basis for further reproaches in criticism of the 1930's and 1940's when Ivanov was condemned mainly for poeticizing the

---

[1] V. Ivanov, Sobranie sochinenii Vol. VIII (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958), p. 296.

[2] E. g., Czech scholars and critics such as L. Reisner, Z. Nejedly, and J. Fucik. See M. Zagradka, "Zdenek Nejedly i sovetskaia literatura 20-kh godov", Russkaia literatura, No. 4 (1963), pp. 222-229.

[3] A. Neverov, "V kruqu zakoldovannom - Vsevolod Ivanov", Korabl', No. 1-2 (1923), pp. 32-33.

spontaneity of the peasant revolutionary movement. This attitude on the part of Soviet criticism is without a doubt the major reason behind the excessive and often seriously damaging revisions carried out by editors as well as by Ivanov himself on Partizanskie povesti. However, it should be stressed at this point that it is impossible to state for certain in most cases whether Ivanov actually initiated the changes in an attempt to bring his work into line with Socialist Realist norms or if there was behind-the-scenes editorial pressure to do so. An examination of Partizanskie povesti shows that each of the three stories underwent some significant changes shortly after the first publication. Subsequently, some were textually revised from edition to edition. This happened with the tale Partizany which was first published separately in the journal Krasnaia Nov', 1921, no. 1. Shortly after its first publication, Ivanov started to rewrite the story and somewhat later he incorporated it into Partizanskie povesti (1932). Thereafter this tale was revised twice by the author himself. The first time was in 1934 when a relatively minor revision of a predominantly stylistic nature was made: strict representation in dialogue of dialecticisms and vernacularisms was abandoned and obscenities were deleted.

The second revision of Partizany in 1952[1] however, was

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Partizany", Vsevolod Ivanov. Povesti, rasskazy, vospominaniia (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1952), pp. 86-149.

of a quite different nature; along with a stylistic revision involving the exclusion of authorial similes and remarks, contextual changes involving the rewriting of whole scenes can be found. It is in this revised form that the text is being printed up to the present time.

Tsvetnye vetra which is the third and last tale in the cycle Partizanskie povesti was revised twice as well. This tale was first published in the journal Epokha in 1922. The first revision was done by the author in 1934 and was quite similar in character to the first revision of Partizany, i.e., dialecticisms and vulgarisms were deleted, phonetic transcription was removed from dialogues and replaced by correct spelling; the lyrical digressions were shortened. In this revised form the tale was printed in Sobranie sochinenii (in two volumes 1937-1938) and then it was omitted from Partizanskie povesti for a long time. In 1957-58 Ivanov revised this tale again changing the character of Nikitin and otherwise altering it contextually, i.e., episodes were revised and shortened. Once again, the latest revised version has become the canonical text for this tale.

However, it was the tale Bronepoezd 14-69 to which the author kept returning, and his efforts resulted in several variations on this tale, and in significantly revised editions. It is this tale, and specifically its 1922, 1934/1968, and 1954 editions that will be analysed and evaluated in the course of this study. The aim of this

thesis is to put into relief those ornamentalist stylistic markers of the 1920's used by Ivanov and many of the Serapion Brotherhood to which he belonged, e.g., ornamentalist tropes, naturalism, ostranenie ("making it strange"), and stikhiinost' (spontaneity). This will be done by juxtaposing the original 1922 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 in which these literary devices appear, with revised versions from later periods. The latter will reflect the incursion of Socialist Realist criteria, e.g., the presence of a "positive hero"; class consciousness; affirmation of the value of man; class antagonism; and historical optimism. Additionally one notes: narodnost' (here understood as the need to write for the masses, employing literary forms meaningful to them); ideinost' (the obligatory adoption of the world-view of the proletariat); and partiinost' (the support for the policies of the Communist Party and its Soviet State).

For the purposes of this thesis, all changes of a strictly politico-ideological character are grouped into a category called ideological orthodoxy.

The analysis of the above versions of Bronepoezd 14-69 will be organized as follows:

Chapter II will discuss the history of Bronepoezd 14-69 and the fate of its variants and editions. It will also introduce the categories of changes appearing in the 1934/1968 and 1954 editions.

Chapter III will discuss the categories of the changes imposed on the abcve cited texts. It will:

a) provide documentation, classification and interpretation of these changes.

b) order the changes on the basis of increasing significance.

Chapter IV will mainly be concerned with the proper evaluation of the changes as manifested within the materials under examination and their overall effect on the work.

CHAPTER II

BRONEPOEZD 14-69

Prior to the discussion of the individual variants and editions of Bronepoezd 14-69, it is appropriate to characterize briefly the story, its plot, and its major characters.

Written originally in 1922, Bronepoezd 14-69 is the second tale which was incorporated into the cycle Partizanskie povesti.

The setting of the story is eastern Siberia at the time of the civil war. The author focuses on the depiction of the partisan movement and the fight against Kolchak and foreign armies.

The plot of Bronepoezd 14-69 is based on an actual event, i.e., the defeat and takeover of an armored train by peasant partisans, who then used the armored train to aid the revolutionaries in the city to bring their uprising to a victorious end.

The major part of the author's attention is devoted to the depiction of partisans as a group. The partisan figures are juxtaposed to the natural setting with which they sometimes amalgamate and sometimes contrast.

Several characters stand out in this dynamic tale of the revolutionary peasant movement. One of the major

characters is Vershinin, the coarse partisan commander. A wave of peasant anger forced Vershinin to become the partisan leader who is ready to dispose of human lives. Vershinin is the true representative of his people. Most often he simply and clearly expresses the thoughts and wishes of the peasant mass: "Ne davai zemliu iapontsu-u!"[1] Sometimes, however Vershinin's task is not easy, since the will of the peasants is not always clearly determined and may be hard to understand. In a difficult moment Vershinin admits: "Ne to narod umom oskudel, ne to is..."[2]

Another noteworthy partisan character is Vaska Okorok. Okorok's wild temperament, inexhaustible energy and childish disposition are inseparable parts of his nature. In the course of the story Okorok is shown as a weak man, afraid of dying.

Still another of the major pro-revolutionary characters is Penteflii Znobov, a former dock worker. Znobov represents the tie between the revolutionary movement of the country and the city. He is depicted as a somewhat more knowledgeable revolutionary as compared to Vershinin's peasant partisans: "My, tiura, po vsem planetam zemliu otymen i trudiashchimsia massam - raspisyvaisia!"[3]

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", Krasnaia Nov', No. 1(1922), p. 88.
[2] Ibid., p. 89.
[3] Ibid., p. 90.

The urban revolutionary movement and the Communist Party are represented in the person of Peklevanov, the chairman of the underground revolutionary city committee. In Bronepoezd 14-69, the urban revolutionary movement plays a role secondary to that of Vershinin's detachments. This may be seen in the way the author has depicted Peklevanov: ... "etot malen'kii vesnushchatyi chelovek v cherepakhovykh ochkakh"...[1] and on another occasion: "... okolo Vershinina suetilsia Peklevanov."[2] Such a depiction of the party representative was criticized by some Soviet censors and scholars.[3]

One of the most interesting characters is captain Nezelasov, the commander of the armored train. The narrator pays considerable attention to this character. Through narration proper as well as through dialogue, the author presents a psychological portrayal of Nezelasov, which focuses on his progressing insanity.

Besides Nezelasov, the enemy side is represented by Obab, Nezelasov's ensign. Obab is noteworthy especially for his vivid, ornamentalist depiction and his contrastive relationship to Nezelasov which is expressed through frequent dialogues.

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", p. 93.
[2] Ibid., p. 123.
[3] L. Gladkovskaia, Put' iskanii (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1973), p. 15.

Having mentioned briefly the outline of the story and its main characters, one can turn to the discussion of the history of Bronepoezd 14-69 and its individual variants and editions.

The writer's work on this particular tale continued all his life. Using textological criteria one can point out that Bronepoezd 14-69 actually exists in three variants - one basic and two derivative. It can be further observed that the basic variant exists in three versions distinguished from one another by differing degrees of stylistic and contextual revision.

The first version of the basic variant is that of 1922 printed in the journal Krasnaia Nov', No. 1(5). It is this variant that serves as the partial basis for chapters II, III, and IV of this study. When preparing the tale for separate publication, Ivanov intensified the expressiveness of his style in the initial paragraph of the tale: In the original work the initial paragraph displayed simple narration:

> Bronepoezd "Poliarnyi" pod no. 14-69 okhranial zheleznodorozhnuiu liniu ot partizanov.
>
> Ostatki kolchakovskoi armii otstupali ot Baikala: v Manzhuriiu, po Amuru - na Vladivostok.
>
> Kapitan Nezelasov, nachal'nik bronepoezda, sidel u sebia v kupe vagona i odnu za drugoi kuril manzhurskie tsigarety strakhivaia pepel v zhivot raskolotogo

chugunnogo kitaiskogo bozhka. [1]

After the first revision in 1922 this paragraph is less expository, having become much more ornamental and expressive:

> Tsifry blesteli pered glazami:
> 85, 64 i eshche 000 .... kak snezhnye chetki.
> .... Na dveriakh kupe, na ramakh okna, na
> remne-kobure revol'vera. I tochno ogromnaia
> miasistaia tsifra - 8, na koike, upadaia
> korotko strizhenoi golovoi v ogromnye - kak
> stepnye dorogi - plechi: praporshchik Obab,
> pomoshchnik kapitana Nezelasova. [2]

The above illustrated changes were positive. In this edition the tale was repeatedly published throughout the 1920's and was incorporated into the first volume of Ivanov's collected works (1928).

However, in 1934 Ivanov revised the tale for the second time,[3] making changes mainly in the lexical material according to the standards for belles lettres which he expressed in discussions with Maksim Gorky.[4]

The 1934 revision of Bronepoezd 14-69 was directed on the one hand to the deletion of frequently occuring dialectisms, especially those in the narrator's speech, and

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", Krasnaia Nov', No. 1(1922), p. 75.

[2] V. Ivanov, Bronepoezd 14-69 (Moskva: Gosizdat, 1922), p. 7.

[3] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", Partizanski povesti (Moskva-Leningrad: Goslitizdat) 1935.

[4] V. Ivanov, "Perepiska s A. M. Gor'kim", Iz dnevnikov i zapisnykh knizhek (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1964) pp. 23, 35.

on the other hand to the deletion of excess verbiage including bizarre and naturalistic depictions. This revision as it was pointed out in an article by N. I. Velikaia,[1] included nearly one hundred changes which are of a significant, and one might add, damaging nature. As opposed to the 1934 revisions of the other Partizanskie povesti, this 1934 edition was ultimately chosen as canonical and thus served as the basis for the latest editions (1968 and 1974) of Bronepoezd 14-69.

The choice of the 1934 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 as canonical stems most probably from somewhat relaxed Soviet policies of the 1960's which followed the period of the rigid regimentation of the creative arts under Stalinism. The critique of the negative effect of revisions imposed on early Soviet literary works which was voiced by some Soviet scholars,[2] constitutes another reason for selecting the less severely revised version as the authoritative text of the tale. This edition also provides comparative material for chapters II, III and IV of this thesis.

The third revision of Bronepoezd 14-69 occured in 1952. In its character it was much more damaging than the second one. This time the text was "impoverished" by the further

---

[1] N. I. Velikaia, "Povest' Vs. Ivanova 'Bronepoezd 14-69' i problema mirovozzrenia, khudozhestvennogo metoda i stilia.", Vsevolod Ivanov (Omsk: Omskii Gosudarstvennyi Pedagogicheskii Institut im. A. M. Gor'kogo, 1970), pp. 69-70.

[2] See Chapter I, p. 1. of this study.

deletion of striking similes, epithets, and metaphors which taken together were largely responsible for the original sparkling quality of Ivanov's writing. Moreover lyrical digressions were truncated and dialogues were frequently smoothed out. The character of the third revision may be documented by the following example in which the unbroken underlining indicates deletion from the 1934 text and the broken underlining indicates an addition to the 1952 text, while brackets indicate lexical modifications.

> Tsifry blesteli pered glazami 84, 64, i eshche 000, kak snezhnye chetki. Na dveriakh kupe, na ramakh okna, na remne-kobure revol'vera. I tochno ogromnaia miasistaia [tsifra] 8, na koike, upadaia korotko strizhenoi golovoi v ogromnye, kak stepnye dorogi plechi - praporshchik Obab, pomoshchnik kapitana Nezelasova. [1]

The above noted truncation is obvious when looking at the 1952 revision:

> Tsifry blesteli pered glazami: na dveriakh kupe, na ramakh okna, na remne, na kobure revol'vera. Vezde!
> Tochno ogromnaia miasistaia [bukva] 8, na koike, upadaia korotko ostrizhenoi golovoi v ogromnye plechi, otdykhaet praporshchik Obab, pomoshchnik kapitana Nezelasova. [2]

After the 1952 revision Bronepoezd 14-69 was printed in Izbrannye sochineniia in two volumes (1954).[3] It was

---

[1] pp. 1935, p. 7.
[2] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69", Vsevolod Ivanov. Povesti, rasskazy, vospominaniia (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1952), p. 9.
[3] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Izbrannye sochineniia Vol. I (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1954), pp. 9-82.

reprinted in the same form during the 1950's. The 1954 edition provides comparative material for chapters II, III and IV of this thesis.

In 1927 Ivanov wrote the play Bronepoezd 14-69 which was based on the material of the original tale. Even though the original theme was carried over from the story, there are some significant differences observable in the play. Among the most obvious is the substitution of dramatic exposition for narrative exposition. The change of genre has also resulted in the loss of ornamentalist description which figures prominently in the narrative. The play Bronepoezd 14-69 differs from the original tale also in that it contains a number of scenes which represent a significant textual addition when compared with the original. This may be seen in the first scene of the play which depicts Nezelasov's family fleeing from the Bolshevik armies to Vladivostok.[1] New characters were incorporated and others underwent substantial alterations, e.g. Peklevanov, the city revolutionary leader. The play marks Ivanov's effort to glorify the Communist party and Lenin himself by playing up Peklevanov's heroism, wisdom and revolutionary strategy.[2] Although the play itself is not going to be further analyzed in this study, its significance may be recognized in its direct influence on later editions of the tale Bronepoezd

---

[1] L. A. Gladkovskaia, Vsevolod Ivanov (Moskva: Prosveshchenie, 1972), p. 106.

[2] Ibid., pp. 113-115.

14-69.

In 1932 Ivanov created the second major narrative-prose variation on Bronepoezd 14-69. The writer reworked the tale for young readers, entitled: Bronepoezd 14-69. Povest' pererabotana avtorom dlia iunoshestva. This version of Bronepoezd 14-69 is, in fact, a direct adaptation of the play. The play affected the second variation of the tale through the addition of new episodes and characters. The depiction of Peklevanov, was also altered according to the play. In general, the resulting tale revealed an increase in narrative exposition, fluency and motivation of episodes.[1] These qualities of the new text may very well be shown through the following citation of the beginning and the end of the tale:

> Bronepoezd "Poliarnyi" no. 14-69 ostanovilsia v taige na stantsii Nikolaevskoi, nepodaleku ot goroda Tbishchenska, sviaz's kotorym byla prervana....
> ..... A k kontsu 1920 goda vsia, za iskliucheniem iuzhnoi chasti, Primorskaia oblast' byla ochishchena ot belogvardeitsev i iapontsev. Pochetnuiu rol' v etom sygral bronepoezd "Poliarnyi" 14-69 pod komandoi Nikity Vershinina, i po nastoiashchee vremia stoit on, vsegda prigotovlennyi k boiu i zashchite SSSR. [2]

In 1957 still another extensive reworking of the above variation of the tale was published.[3] New chapters were

---

[1] L. A. Gladkovskaia, "Kommentarii", Partizanskie povesti (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1973), p. 613.
[2] Ibid.
[3] V. Ivanov, Bronepoezd 14-69 (Moskva: Detgiz) 1957.

written which were partly inspired by the play, new characters were incorporated and clarity of narrative exposition reached a peak. This extensive editorial activity is apparent from examining the initial paragraph of the tale:

> Byl mutnyi rassvet. Gosti tolpilis' na kryl'tse. Pirushka okonchilas'. Varia, nevesta kapitana Nezelasova, zameshkalas' vo vnutrennikh komnatakh s Verochkoi, docher'iu polkovnika Katina, komendanta kreposti. Nezelasov stoial u poroga, derzha v ruke slegka vlazhnuiu ot tumana shelkovuiu nakidku. [1]

In the above cited passage one may observe the addition of two new characters e.g., colonel Katin and his daughter Verochka. It is not only the increase in the number of characters that marks the different quality of the 1957 edition. One of the major changes in this version of Bronepoezd 14-69 is the increased motivation of episodes. This is demonstrated by providing new links between individual characters and the way they are introduced in the tale, e.g., by giving a detailed description of their background. Increased attention to motivation is clearly observable where Vershinin and his family are concerned. Vershinin's hatred of the armored train and its crew is now motivated by making Nezelasov's ensign Obab directly responsible for the killing of Vershinin's sons.

> Podplyla lodka s rybakami.
> - Nikita Egorych, tebia ishchem, - tikho skazal Kol'sha.

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958), p. 547.

- Dlia goria, Nikita Egorych, - eshche tishe sheptal Sumkin.
- Dlia goria, muzhiki? - pochti s voplem sprosila Nastas'iushka.
- Dlia kakogo goria? - vzvolnovanno skazal Vershinin.
- Beda, Nikita Egorych, - otvetil Sumkin. - Volost' poslala za toboi.
- Nu, koli volost' poslala, znachit, plokho.
- Okruzhaiut nashe selo karateli: synck nashego lavochnika starika Obaba, praporshchik. Staviat pulemety. Tol'ko, znachit, ty uekhal, oni po nas - iz pulemetov. I v starogo i v malogo, ne gliadia!...
...- Kogda my uezzhali, vash tiaten'ka - Egor Ivanych po detiam panikhidu sluzhili. I Mitiu, znachit, i Sashen'ku pominali. [1]

This particular passage can also serve to illustrate the extent of textual additions in the 1957 version of Bronepoezd 14-69. This may best be shown by juxtaposing the above passage to the corresponding parts in the 1954, 1968 and 1922 versions of the tale. In citing the 1954 corresponding passage, one may note some similarity in the fate of the children which motivates Vershinin to join the revolutionaries in fighting the enemy:

... rebiatishki rosli svetlovolosye - srebrocheshuiniki. Srubil izbu, sutunki sam taskal iz taigi.
Detei bereg ot syrosti i likhomanok, A vot sozhgli iapontsy izbu, detei - vse schastie. [2]

Compare now the identical passage as it appears in the 1922 and 1934/1968 texts:

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I. (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958), pp. 559-560.

[2] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Izbrannye proizvedenia, Vol. I (Moskva: Goslitizdat, 1954), p. 20. Henceforth B 14-69, 1954.

... rebiatishki rosli svetlovolosye -

srebrocheshuiniki. [1]

It is not only Vershinin for whom extensive background and motivation is provided in the 1957 edition. Peklevanov, Nezelasov, Obab and Masha (Peklevanov's fiance) are among those for whom detailed clarifying backgroung material is provided. The following citation which provides details from Masha's backround, does not appear in either 1922 or 1934/1968 and 1954 texts.

> Gorodskoi vrach Sotin, pozhiloi, morshchinistyi, istoshchennyi zabotami, toroplivo sobiralsia k bol'nomu. Vvedeno voennoe polozhenie, a na ulitse uzhe vecher. Khorosho by ostat'sia doma, slushat' v kresle, kak Masha riadom perelistyvaet Gleba Uspenskogo i gladit koshku, kotoraia to vsprygnet k nei na koleni, to zaberetsia na stol i dotronetsia ostorozhno lapkoi do knizhnogo perepleta.
>
> Zhena stoit s raskrytym chemodanchikom, i glaza ee perebegaiut s litsa muzha na litso docheri. Kakaia trevoga v ee glazakh! Kak mnogo ona chuvstvuet - i kak malo ponimaet v tom, chto proiskhodit! [2]

The 1957 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 also displays a much stronger tie between the city revolutionary organization and the partizan detachment. This may best be seen when examining the relationship between Vershinin and

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Krasnaia Nov' 1922, No. 1, p. 82. Henceforth B 14-69, 1922
and V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Izbrannye proizvedenia Vol. II (Moskva, Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1968) p. 75. Henceforth B 14-69, 1968.

[2] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958) p. 575. Henceforth B 14-69, 1958.

Peklevanov. In the 1957 edition a meeting between Vershinin and Peklevanov occurs already in the first chapter of the tale:

> Lodka Znobova bort o bort neslyshno plyla riadom s lodkoi Vershinina. Rybaki derzhalis' v nekotorom otdalenii. Vershinin sidel sgorbivshis', opusttiv ruki na golovu zheny. Peklevanov, prislonias' k machte, molcha gliadel na Vershinina. Vecherelo. Sinevataia dymka tumana kolykhalas', prikryvaia lodki.
>
> Nakonets Peklevanov skazal:
>
> - Poka my plyli k vam, Nikita Egorych, my s tovarishchami iz revkoma podschityvali svoi sily. Poluchaetsia, odoleem. Nado gorodu eshche vosstavat'. Teper' odoleem! Esli, razumeetsia, vy pomozhete nam. [1]

In the 1922, 1954 and 1968 texts Peklevanov and Vershinin do not meet until much later. Actually, in the original story it is not until the concluding part of the tale when these two characters meet directly:

> Okolo Vershinina suetilsia Peklevanov.
>
> - Nam pridetsia nachinat', Nikita Egorych. (Peklevanov) [2]

The 1954 and 1968 texts show Vershinin meeting Peklevanov when the latter visits the partisan detachment at the time of the attack on the armored train:

> Na rassvete priekhal Peklevanov. V portfele u nego lezhali proklamatsii, i odno steklo ochkov bylo slomano napolovinu. [3]

Other changes in the 1957 edition include deletions and alterations of naturalism and eroticism. Whole scenes were

---

[1] B 14-69, 1958, p. 562.
[2] B 14-69, 1922, p. 123.
[3] B 14-69, 1954, p. 70
and B 14-69, 1968, p. 124.

rewritten in order to maintain Socialist Realist norms regarding proper Soviet morality. This is well illustrated by the following episode depicting a meeting between Vershinin and his wife after the takeover of the armored train. In the 1922 and 1968 texts this episode appears in almost identical form displaying the original eroticism:

> Na krovati - Vershinin: dyshet gluboko i merno, lish' vnutri gorit, - ot dykhania ego tiazhelo v kupe. Khot' dveri i nastezh'. Zemlianoi vozdukh, tiazhelyi, muzhitskii.
> Riadom - baba. Otkuda prishla - poddalas' grudiami vpered vsia, trepykhaet.
> Nastas'iushka. Zhena!
> Oret Znobov:
> - Nashla? On paren' dobrai!... [1]

The 1957 edition totally deletes the eroticism in this particular scene:

> Na koike - Vershinin; dyshit gluboko i merno, lish' vnutri gorit, - ot dykhaniia ego tiazhelo v kupe, khot' dveri i nastezh'. Zemlianoi vozdukh, tiazhelyi, mushitskii.
> - Musha! Student! Shurka! Vy-kto? Mashinisty sostavov so snariadami? (Vershinin) [2]

The above cited examples represent only a small part of the imposed changes. However, by looking at them one can very well picture the total extent of the 1957 revision. It should also be noted that after this particular revision the volume of the tale was increased by fifty per cent. Although all the initial chapters remained in the tale, one notes

---

[1] B 14-69, 1922, p. 120.
and B 14-69, 1968, p. 132.
[2] B 14-69, 1958, p. 693.
Note: The unbroken underlining indicates the parts deleted or altered in the 1957 edition and the broken underlining marks the addition in the 1954 and 1968 texts.

that embedded as they are within the layers of this expansive revision, they have lost their original expressiveness and lyricism. It was nevertheless this version of Bronepoezd 14-69 which was printed as the canonical one in the second set of the collected works of Vs. Ivanov, and in other editions of the late 1950's[1] and early 1960's.

Before concluding this chapter it is fitting to present examples of the various types of changes which occur in the above mentioned versions of Bronepoezd 14-69. Some categories of changes are not as important to the quality of the text as others. Indeed, some examples are so insignificant for the purposes of this study that they will be excluded from further analysis and discussion. These include the following:

a) dialectisms and instances of substandard usage which are frequent in the original version and which are inconsistently deleted or "corrected" in later versions:

khalipa (1922, 1968)	muzhik (1954)
transhpanka (1922)	telezhka (1954, 1968)
ne sikel'di (1922, 1968)	ne krutis' (1954)
turnut' (1922)	tronut' (1954, 1968)
lagushka (1922, 1968)	badeika (1954)

Even though there will not be any further discussion of this type of changes, it should be pointed out that cumulatively, the removal of these exotic features is part of a

---

[1] V. Ivanov, "Bronepoezd 14-69" in Povesti velikikh let (Moskva: Sovetskaia Rossia, 1958), pp. 11-169.

"deornamentalizing" trend toward a general standardization of the language, i.e., toward the revival of a classicist normative principle in Soviet literature.

b) grammatically incorrect expressions appearing in the 1922 version which are corrected in later versions, although sometimes these are restored to their original state in the 1968 version.

domov iz takovogo kamniu (1922, 1968)	domov iz takovogo kamnia (1954)
ponimat (1922)	ponimaet (1954, 1968)
stroiut (1922, 1968)	stroiat (1954)
khris'iane (1922)	khrist'iane (1954, 1968)

c) phonetic transcription of the Chinese pronunciation of Russian expressions:

treepanga-a (1922)	tleepanga-a (1954, 1968)[1]

d) foreign words which occur in the original version and which are often deleted or substituted by corresponding Russian expressions in later versions:

---

[1] This actually is one of the few improvements achieved by the second revision. Some others involving lexical selection can be found, e.g.,

> Nezelasovu ne khotelos' itti po perronu. Obognuv obshitye stal'nymi listami vagony bronepoezda, on poshel sredi teplushek evakuiruemykh bezhentzev.
> See B 14-69, 1922, p. 77.

When comparing this passage to the 1954 and 1968 versions, better selection of the corresponding verbs may be observed:

> Nezelasovu ne khotelos' tol'kat'sia po perronu, i obognuv obshitye stal'nymi shchitami vagony bronepoezda, on brel sredi teplushek s evakuiruemymi bezhentsami.
> See B 14-69, 1954, p. 12.
> and B 14-69, 1968, p. 66.

bebut (1922)	-- (1954, 1968)
po doroge Khuan-tsi-tsze (1922, 1968)	po doroge Vosstanii (1954)
v zheltykh getrakh (1922)	v zheltykh kragakh (1954, 1968)

e) lexical changes which do not represent any significant change in the quality of the text:

morskce obvetrie (1922)	morskoi veter (1954, 1968)
skrivivsheesia litso Nezelasova (1922)	iskrivivshiesia muskuly kapitana (1954, 1968)

There are however some instances where just a simple deletion of one epithet or a short phrase mauy result in a rather significant change in character depiction or change in relationship between two or more characters.

> Praporshchik Obab ogliadel - naiskos' skrivivsheesia litso Nezelasova, medlenno otvetil: - Vam lechit'sia nado. Praporshchik Obab byl iz vysluzhivshikhsia dobrovoltsev kolchakovskoi armii, obo vsekh kadrovykh ofitserakh govoril Lechit'sia nado! Kapitana Nezelasova on uvazhal i potomu povtoril - Bez lechenia plokho. Vam. [1]

\- - -

> Obab naiskos' ogliadel iskrivivshiesia litsevye muskuly kapitana. Otvetil:
> - Vam lechit'sia. Nado.
> Byl praporshchik Obab iz vysluzhivshkhsia dobrovoltsev kolchakovskoi armii. O vsekh kadrovykh ofitserakh govoril:
> "Splosh' boleznia."
> - Bez lechenia plokho. Vam. [2]

Minor changes in address between Obab and Nezelasov and the deleted part of the narrator's speech indicate decreased

---

[1] B 14-69, 1922, p. 75.
[2] B 14-69, 1954, p. 9.

respect by Obab for Nezelasov in the 1954 version.

Although such changes can be cumulatively significant, the main concern of this study will be to trace the presence and absence of those features which have a decisive bearing on the artistic quality of the tale and which affect its representativeness as a work of the early 1920's. This involves the deletion or modification of:

Ornamentalism involving

a) naturalism

> Narumianennaia zhenshchina s tolstym zadom, napominavshim dva meshka, vsunutye pod iubku, vskolykhnula v mozgu predlozhenie Obaba. [1]
>
> - - -
>
> Narumianennaia zhenshchina napomnila predlozhenie Obaba. [2]
>
> - - -
>
> Narumianennaia zhenshchina s tolstym zadom vskolykhnula v tele predlozhenie Obaba. [3]

b) Ornamentalist tropes

> Obab perevernulsia, pospeshno ubiraia spinu, kak ubiraiut rvanuiu podkladku plat'ia. [4]
>
> - - -
>
> Obab povernulsia, pospeshno ubiraia spinu. [5]

c) Ostranenie

> I telo u nikh bylo, kak... [6]

---

[1] B 14-69, 1922, p. 77.
[2] B 14-69, 1954, p. 12.
[3] B 14-69, 1968, p. 66.
[4] B 14-69, 1922, p. 100.
[5] B 14-69, 1954, p. 47.
[6] B 14-69, 1922, p. 80.

- - -

I telo partizan bylo, kak... [1]

or

Obozhi, Ne orali eshche. [2]

- - -

Obozhdi. Ne orali eshche. Narodu pooprat' nado. [3]

In the case of the preceding examples referential clarity replaces the original ostranenie.

Ideological orthodoxy:

- - - [4]

- Ty poniala, Masha, da? Ty ponimaesh', chto bol'shevik, po prikazu partii, dolzhen zhertvovat' vsem, dazhe zhizn'iu, v liuboi moment? [5]

Although the changes in the ideological orthodoxy category may not affect directly the style and form of the work, it is important to pay attention to changes of this sort because they seriously affect the credibility of the work and its artistic quality in general. These changes are especially obvious in the 1954 version.

In the opening chapter to the study we have sought to justify it by pointing to examples of revisions in Soviet literary works. These revisions affected mostly stylistic

---

[1] B 14-69, 1954, p. 17.
[2] B 14-69, 1922, p. 104.
[3] B 14-69, 1954, p. 52.
[4] B 14-69, 1922, p. 106.
[5] B 14-69, 1958, p. 689.

markers of the 1920's which were defined and discussed in relation to the works in which they appeared.

With respect to the editing of V. Ivanov's Partizanskie povesti we have concentrated mainly on Bronepoezd 14-69 since this tale is the prime subject of the ensuing study. Now that the main types of changes imposed on this work by several revisions have been demonstrated, we can turn to the extensive classificatiocn of changes that affect the artistic quality of the tale.

CHAPTER III

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE 1922, 1954 AND 1968 VERSIONS OF "BRONEPOEZD 14-69".

The purpose of this chapter is to present in detail all the important changes that occur in the 1954 and 1968 versions of Bronepoezd 14-69. This has resulted in the selection of one hundred eighteen changes, which, as shown previously, can be grouped in the following categories: characterization, ideological orthodoxy, and ornamentalism involving naturalism, ornamentalist tropes, and ostranenie ("making it strange"). These categories are not perfectly neat but can overlap, e.g., changes in style can affect characterization. This overlapping effect applies especially to the changes of a politico-ideological character because ideological orthodoxy underlies most of the changes in the other categories.

In order to achieve a clear view of the materials under examination, the changes within each section will be organized chronologically. This means that the changes incorporated in both the 1954 and 1968 texts are presented together, and changes proper only to the 1954 edition are also presented in one group.

Where uncertainty in the attribution of utterances is possible, identification of the speakers involved will be provided by stating their names in parentheses along with their utterances. Otherwise, where no identification of the

speaker is given it means that the statement was made by the narrator.

CHARACTERIZATION CHANGE

This category comprises alterations which affect inner and outer qualities of the characters as well as alterations of their names and interrelationships.

A) Changes incorporated both in the 1954 and 1968 texts

The character of captain Nezelasov underwent a significant alteration. At the beginning of the story both the revised texts provide additional information about Nezelasov. At the same time this textual revision also marks the change in the relationship between Nezelasov and Obab by indicating Nezelasov's weakness and diminished authority.

1922, p. 77

> Kapitan otoshel k oknu. Tikho zviaknul steklom.

1954, pp. 11-12; 1968, p. 66

> Kapitan zatianul remen' i khotel rezko prokrichat': - Nu i ne rassuzhdat', ispolniaite prikazaniia. - a vmesto etogo otvernulsia i, skuchno tsarapaia pal'tsem krasku ramy, sprosil tikhon'koi:...

Further attempts to lower Nezelasov may be demonstrated by citing an additional passage which appears in the first chapter of the story. This addition contains the text of Nezelasov's telegram in which he evidently exaggerates about a victorious battle with Vershinin. Since there is no direct mention of such a battle in the story, this lowers

Nezelasov's credibility. At the same time this additional passage enhances textual clarity as opposed to the original version where the narrator does not always disclose everything but leaves it for the reader to conclude on the basis of his own impression.

1922, p. 79

- - -

1954, p. 17; 1968, p. 71

Ob'edinennym russko-iaponskim otriadom, pri podderzhke bronepoezda No. 14-69, partizanskie shaiki Vershinina rasseiany.
S nashei storony ubitykh 42, ranenykh 115.
Boevaia vyderzhka soiuznikov vyshe vsiakikh pokhval. Presledovanie protivnika v sopkakh prodolzhaetsia.
Nach. bronepoezda No. 14-69 kapitan Nezelasov.
No. 8701-19. (Nezelasov)

Obab is another character upon whom revisions have been imposed. The alteration of Obab's character was done chiefly through changes in his speech. In both the revised texts Obab is depicted as disrespectful, and increasingly confused.

1922, p. 77

- Ne znaiu. Ne moia obiazannost' dumat'.
(Obab) I kak gus' nevyrosshimi esche kryl'iami, kolykhaia shirochaishimi galife, Obab ushel.

1954, p. 12

- Ne znaiu... Streliat' - budem streliat', ochen' prosto. (Obab)
I, kak gus' neotrosshimi kryl'iami, kolykhaia galife, Obab shel po koridoru vagona i bormotal:
- Ne moia obiazannost'... dumat'... Ia chto?.. Lenta, a oboima... Ochen' nuzhno... dumat'...

1968, p. 66

- Ne znaiu.. Vodu tak vodu ... Streliat', budem streliat' - ochen' prosto. (Obab)
I kak gus' neotrosshimi kryl'iami, kolykhaia galife, Obab shel po koridoru vagona i bormatal:
- Ne mcia obiazannost'... dumat'... ia chto... lenta, oboima... Ochen' nuzhno... Gde? (Obab)

The overall trend appears to be to lessen the credibility and authority of the enemy soldiers by ridiculing them and by pointing out their fear, their confusion and their lack of discipline:

1922, p. 72

Nenuzhnye triapki odezhdy stesniali dvizheniia u stal'nykh orudii.

1954, p. 16; 1968, p. 70

Nenuzhnye triapki odezhd stesniali dvizheniia. Okolo stal'nykh orudii khotelos' ikh videt' golymi i ne khotelos' chuvstvovat' tleiushchikh v strakhe dush.

From the above examples it is obvious that the revised texts highlight negative aspects of the White soldiers. On the other hand, where the partisans are concerned, the trend is to improve their image through additions and deletions of their utterances and through changes in the narrator's speech.

An example of such an effort may be seen when one of the partisans is captured by the enemy. The original depiction of weakness and emotion in the captured partisan who is about to be executed, is deleted.

1922, p. 97

Strogo ogliadelsia, no opiat', obvoloklvi toskoi, spriatal glaza.

1954, p. 42; 1968, p. 96

Strogo ogliadelsia, no opiat' spriatal glaza.

The attempt to improve the image of the revolutionaries may also be seen through deletions of vulgarisms in their speech. On this particular occasion Znobov directs an obscenity at a Janapese officer when passing him in the street:

1922, p. 95

Khriu! Chushka ty, edrena vosh'! (Znobov)

1954, p. 35; 1968, p. 89

Khriu! Chushka ty! (Znobov) [1]

However, deletions of the same kind may also be observed in the speech of the enemy characters, the reason for this being the effort to comply with Socialist Realist strictures against the printing of obscenities.

1922, p. 117

Tudy vashu!... tudy vashu! (soldier)

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 114
- Ne uidesh', kurva! (Vershinin)
1954, p. 67; 168, p. 122
- Ne uidesh'! (Vershinin)
and 1922, p. 92
Bardak, a ne Rasseia, (Znobov)
1954, p. 30; 1968, p. 84
Kabak, a ne Rasseia! (Znobov)
and 1922, p. 120
- Nu vas, grit, k edrenoi materi! (partisans)
1954, p. 75; 1968, p. 130
- Nu vas! - Grit! (partisans)

1954, p. 72; 1968, p. 127

Tudy! tudy! (soldier) [1]

Changes assembled in this group include also alterations of characters' names, e.g., the renaming of the enemy headquarters:

1922, p. 125

V shtabe generala Samova.

1954, 80; 1968, p. 135

V shtabe generala Spasskogo.

A possible reason for this type of changes might be the influence of the play Bronepoezd 14-69.[2]

B) Changes incorporated only in the 1954 edition

In the 1954 edition the changes are more severe. This is especially so in the case of captain Nezelasov. In the original story the narrator depicts Nezelasov as going insane. However, in the 1954 edition, this feature is reduced, thereby making the text less psychological and easier to understand. At the same time, through maintaining Nezelasov's sanity Ivanov provides a greater obstacle for the partisans to overcome and thus elevates their military prowess and revolutionary heroism.

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 100
My-t'... Da ia ikh... mat'! (Obab)
1954, p. 47
- - -
1968, p. 101
- Da ia ikh..., (Obab)

[2] See Chapter II, p. 26 of this study.

An example of such a change may be observed at the beginning of the story where the narrator depicts Nezelasov's behaviour when commanding the armored train.

1922, p. 79; 1968, p. 69

Dal'she on ne ponimal, dlia chego ponadobilsia emu ego krik,

1954, p. 16

- - -[1]

Besides diminishing Nezelasov's insanity, the 1954 edition shows Nezelasov being aware of his own guilt and wrongdoing while in the original this is not clearly so.

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 99; 1968, p. 101
Za nei parovoz vzorvetsia, soidet s uma.
- Vse my ... da ... v parovoza ...
(Nezelasov)

1954, p. 46
Za nei parovoz vzorvetsia, soidet s uma.
(Nezelasov)

and 1922, p. 100; 1968, p. 101
Nichto. Poteriali! koromyslo est' ... net ni, chashek ni gir' ... Kogo i chem my veshat' budem ...
(Nezelasov)

1954, p. 74
- - -

and 1922, p. 118; 1968, p. 128
Rassmeialsia i, mozhet byt', zakhokhotal.

1954, p. 74
Rassmeialsia.

and 1922, p. 118; 1968, p. 128
Kustarnik - v ruke, a drugoi ruki ne chuvstvuet.
Kustarnik mozhno otlomit' spokoino i dazhe sunut' v rot. Eto ne ukho.
- A na sapoge karabin, znachit tozhe iz poezda ushel. (Nezelasov, int. monologue)

1954, p. 73
Cherez plecho karabin. Znachit iz poezda ushel?
(Nezelasov, int. monologue)

An attempt of this sort may be observed through the change and simplification of Nezelasov's speech while he speaks with Obab;

1922, p. 100; 1968, p. 101

- A. Zemlia zdes' vot ... Za oknami ... Kak vy ... vot ... poka ... ona vas. ... proklinaet, a? (Nezelasov)

1954, p. 47

- A ... Zemlia zdes' vot ... za oknami ... ona nas proklinaet, a? (Nezelasov)

Other character alterations observable in the 1954 edition are those regarding the partisans and revolutionaries. The 1954 version further "improves" their image and enhances their respectability even at the price of diminishing the credibility and artistic quality of the story.

One of the best examples of such editing is evident from a substantial characterization change in Okorok. While in the original story Okorok shows fear of death and leaves his suicidal position on the rails next to Sin-Bin-U, where the armored train was likely to run over them, the 1954 text alters the whole episode by lenghtening it artificially and thus giving Okcrok an opportunity to get out of the situation without showing cowardice.

This extensive revision damaged also the characters of Sin-Bin-U and Vershinin through giving them highly artificial utterances about mutual Soviet-Chinese respect

and thus reflecting anachronistically the official political line of the 1950's.

1922, p. 110; 1968, pp. 116-117

> Pripodnialsia na loktiakh. Litso stianulos' v odnu zheltuiu morshchinu, glaza kak dve alye slezy ...
> - Ne mogu-u!.. dusha-a!.. (Okorok)
> Muzhiki molchali.
> Kitaets otkinul vintovku i popolz vverkh:
> - Kuda? - sprosil Znobov.
> Sin-Bin-U, ne oborachivaias', skazal:
> - Sykmuuchna-a!.. Vasika'a! (Sin-Bin-U)
> I leg s Vas'koi riadom.
> Morshchilos', temnelo, kak osennii list, litso zheltoe. Shpala plakala. Chelovek li otpolzal vniz po otkosu, kusty li kogo prinimali - ne znal, ne videl Sin-Bin-U...
> - Ne mogu u!.. bratani i!.. - plakal Vas'ka, otpolzaia vniz.
> Sliuniavilas' trava, sliuniavilos' nebo...

1954, pp. 61-62

> Pripodnialsia na loktiakh. Litso stianulos' v odnu zheltuiu morshchinu, glaza - kak dve alye slezy...
> Muzhiki molchali.
> Kitaets otkinul vintovku i popolz vverkh po nasypi.
> - Kuda? - sprosil Znobov.
> Sin-Bin-u, ne oborachivaias', skazal:
> - Sykuuchna-a!.. Vasika! (Sib-Bin-U)
> I leg s Vas'koi riadom.
> - Net ty obozhdi, kitai-chelovek! - skazal bystro Vershinin, - Vas'ka leg i lezhat' budet obiazatel'no. On za svoiu zemliu lezhit. Za svoiu!.. (Vershinin)
> Sin-Bin-u pripodnialsia. Ne pokidaia nasypi, ubeditel'no, goriacho i strastno govoril on ottuda Vershininu:
> - O ty ... ty est' nastoiasii siloveke!.. Ia vash narod khochu pokazat'!.. Serdtse - moi narod pokazat'!..
> Volnuias', staraias' vniknut v smysl slova kitaitsa, Vershinin pospeshno dopytyvalsia:
> - Uvazhen'e, chto li, khochesh' pokazat'?
> Kitaets obradovalsia, chto Vershinin ego ponimaet.
> Sin-Bin-u bystro govoril:
> - Da-da! Uvazhen'e kitaiski naroda russki naroda!

Togda Vershinin skazal Vas'ke:
- Kitaets uvazhen'e Rasee khochet pokazat'. Ponial, Vasilii? Ne meshai emu. On velikuiu svoiu dushu khochet pokazat'!
I, pomolchav nemnogo, podumav, strogo prikazal:
- Idi siuda, Vas'ka. (Vershinin)
- Ne mogu! Ne poidu ia otsiuda, Nikita Egorych! (Okorok)
- Idi siuda, Vasilii! - esche strozhe progovoril Vershinin. - Ia tebe drugoe, to zhe sil'noe delo naidu. Tvoia zhizn' potrebuetsia. Idi.
- Da chto zhe eto, bratsy? - stonaia, ogliadyvaias' v negodovanii vokrug, spolzal nekhotia s nasypi Vas'ka[1]

Besides altering characters' names, the 1954 edition changed Nezelasov's baby-daugther into a fiance. The reason

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 79; 1968, p. 71
... i Penteflii Znobov radostno proryvaia chrez podprygivaiushchie zuby nalitye nezyblemoiu veroiu slova.
1954, p. 17
... i Penteflii Znobov radostno krichal nalitye nezyblemoiu veroiu slova.
and 1922, p. 92; 1968, p. 84
U menia v golove-to seichas scvsem kak v tserkvi kliros. Svoi voidut, poiut, a ostal'naia publika tol'ko slushai. (Znobov)
1954, p. 29
Zabotv mnogo ... Pelena v glazakh. (Znobov)
and 1922, p. 109; 1968, p. 115
Vershinin i ves' shtab, mokrye, stydlivo lezhali v kustarnikakh.
1954, p. 60
Vershinin i ves' shtab lezhali v kustarnikakh.
and 1922, p. 97; 1968, p. 97 (re: the executed partisan)
Kogda v nego streliali, soldatam kazalos' chto oni streliaiut v trup.
1954, p. 42
- - -
and 1922, p. 123; 1968, p. 135
Okolo Vershinina suetilsia Peklevanov.
1954, p. 79
Okolo Vershinina stoial Peklevanov.

for this particular alteration is most probably an effort to induce less sympathy for a man worried about his fiance than a man who is worried about his little child.

1922, p. 100; 1968, p. 102

Tridtsat', i u menia rebenochek - Va-a-al'ka.
I nogti u nego rozovye, Obab? (Nezelasov)

1954, p. 47

Tridtsat', i u menia nevesta Va-ren'ka...
I nogti u nee rozovye, Obab... (Nezelasov)

Although the 1968 version restores the original text at this point, later on, on page 127, the 1968 version inconsistently upholds the 1954 revision and refers to Nezelasov's "fiance", thereby lowering the quality of the story.

Peklevanov is another character whose name and patronymic was for some strange reason inexplicably changed in the 1954 edition. This is evident from the altered speech of the "shortlegged" revolutionary when he addresses Peklevanov:

1922, p. 106; 1968, p. 111

Vasillii Maksimych, ... (korotkonogii)

1954, p. 56

Il'ia Gerasimovich, ... (korotkonogii)

ORNAMENTALISM involving:

NATURALISM

A) Changes incorporated in both the 1954 and 1968 texts

Naturalism in the revised versions of Bronepoezd 14-69

is diminished. Examples of this sort may be observed in the depiction of the characters as well as in the depiction of the setting. One such change may be observed at the scene where the narrator describes an unbuttoned Znobov as seen by the partisans. Here, the added text prevents the reader from imagining the worst.

1922, p. 84

> Partizany posmotreli na ego lokhmatye, kak lisii khvost usy, na rasstegnuvshuiusia prorekhu shtanov, i zamolchali.

1954, p. 24; 1968, p. 79

> Partizany posmotreli na ego lokhmatye, kak lisii khvost, usy, na rasstegnuvshuiusia prorekhu shtanov, cherez kotoruiu vidnelos' temnoe telo, i zamolchali.

In another instance of this kind of revision, a difference in the degree of the imposed deletions may by observed by comparing the revised texts. This particular deletion affects the narrator's naturalist depiction of a woman at the railway station as seen by Nezelasov:

1922, p. 77

Narumianennaia zhenshchina s tolstym zadom, napominavshim dva meshka, vsunutye pod iubku, vskolykhnula v mozgu predlozhenie Obaba.

The most extensive deletion of naturalist features may be observed in the 1954 text. In this particular edition the sentence appears without the original naturalism and eroticism.

1954, p. 12

> Narumianennaia zhenshchina napomnila predlozhenie Obaba.

The 1968 - canonical version displays a partial restoration of naturalism in the identical passage:

1968, p. 66

Narumianennaia zhenshchina s tolstym zadom vskolykhnula v tele predlozhenie Obaba.

Naturalist effects involving setting are also diminished in the revised texts. Revisions of this kind are often imposed through deletions in or alterations of the narrator's speech. Such is the case where the deletion of the epithet "kyslyi" reduces the naturalist effect of the setting.

1922, p. 88

Veter otnes kislyi zapakh pota.

1954, p. 36; 1968, p. 91

Veter nes zapakh pota.

Another type of change in this group involves naturalist phrases used by various characters. These have in some cases been deleted or altered so as to minimize their effect. This may be observed in the following utterance where Okorok refers to the Japanese soldiers:

1922, p. 81

Iapontsa, Nikita Egorych, turnut' zdorovo, nado. Nabil im briukho zemliei - i v more. (Okorok)

1954, p. 19

Iapontsa, Nikita Egorych, tronut' zdorovo nado. (Okorok)

1968, p. 73

Iapontsa, Nikita Egorych, tronut' zdorovo nado. Nabil im briukho zemlei - i v more. (Okorck)

Another change observable at this point may be classified as lexical, e.g., vernacular "turnut'" in the 1922 text was changed into literary "tronut'": the threat takes on a more acceptable form in the two newer versions.

B) Changes incorporated only in the 1954 text

As is true of all types of revisions within this section, revisions affecting naturalism are more frequent in the 1954 edition.

Among such changes are those which affect the depiction of individual characters and their behaviour. For example, an extensive revision of Nezelasov's speech at the outset of the story removes naturalist expressions from his utterance, and at the same time plays down Nezelasov's insanity.

1922, p. 76; 1968, p. 64

V golove, kak nasedka, da u nei trista iaits! Vysizhivaet. E-ekh! ... Teplyn', par ... koposhitsia teploe, slizkoe, togo gliadi ... vylezet. (Nezelasov)

1954, p. 10

V golove - nekhorosho. (Nezelasov) [1]

The revisions in this group include those which affect the physical qualities of the characters. The general trend in this area is to minimize repulsive naturalist depiction in order to comply with Socialist Realism criteria, involving morality, good taste, and the positive portrayal of socialist heroes. This is seen in the following passage where Ivanov deletes a naturalist simile comparing the partisans with boars and excludes an unfavourable reference to their confusion.

1922, p. 81; 1968, p. 74

> Partizany, kak stado kabanov ot lesnogo pozhara, kinuv logovishcha, v smiatenii i zlobe rvalis' v gory.

1954, p. 30

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 76; 1968, p. 65
Spokoi, kogda miaso rzhaveet. (Obab)
1954, p. 11
- - -
and 1922, p. 78; 1968, p. 68
I vtykaia v glotku nepochtitel'nui smeshok, chetko govoril: ...
1954, p. 14
I s nepochtitel'nym smeshkom chetko govoril: ...

Partizany v zlobe rvalis' v gory. [1]

In the area of the setting the naturalist effects were also severely truncated or deleted in the 1954 version. This was done chiefly through alterations of the narrator's

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 88; 1968, p. 90
--- i pakhnut' muzhiki skotom i travami.
1954, p. 36
... i pakhnut' muzhiki zemlei i travami.
and 1922, p. 124; 1968, p. 137
I eshche, i eshche ravninnye temnolitsye krest'iane s odinakovym rovnym, kak u ustalogo stada shagom ...
1954, p. 82
I eshche, i eshche ravninnye temnolitsye krest'iane s odinakovym, rovnym ustalym shagom.
and 1922, p. 103; 1968, p. 106
Bylo u nego [u Vershinina] lokhmovolosatoe, zverinoe litso.
1954, p. 51
Bylo u nego [u Vershinina] istoshchennoe litso.
and 1922, p. 122; 1968, p. 134
Boroda u nego [u storozha] byla sedovataia, kak istlevshii navoz, i pakhlo ot nego kuriatnikom.
1954, p. 79
Boroda u nego byla sedovataia.
and 1922, p. 115; 1968, p. 124
O such'ia kustarnikov tseplialis' litsa, putalis' i rvalis' borody i iz potnogo mokrogo volosa lezli naruzhu guby.
1954, p. 69
O such'ia kustarnikov tseplialis' litsa, putalis' i rvalis' borody.
and 1922, p. 113; 1968, p. 120
Ranennye, kotorye posil'nee, rugali bab maternoi bran'iu, a tiazhelo ranennye, podprygivaia na korniakh, raskryvali vozdukhu i opadaiushchemu zheltomu listu svoi polye kuski miasa.
1954, p. 66
Ranennye, kotorye posil'nee, rugali bab, a tiazhelo ranennye, podprygivaia na triaskikh telegakh, raskryvali vozdukhu i opadavshemu listu svoi sukhie, potreskavshiesia guby.

speech. An example which illustrates this type of revision occurs in the first chapter of the story where the narrator depicts the railway station. Here one observes the deletion of a naturalist simile.

1922, p. 76; 1968, p. 64

> Kak banka s cherviami, potela plotno nabitaia liud'mi stantsiia.

1954, p. 10

> Potela plotno nabitaia liud'mi stantsiia. [1]

Eroticism in the 1954 text is also markedly reduced. This may be observed where characters as well as the setting are concerned.

This type of revision may be illustrated by juxtaposing the original and the 1954 version of a scene where the narrator depicts the meeting between Vershinin and his wife:

1922, p. 120; 1968, p. 132

> Noch'iu opiat' prishla zhena, zadyshala - zapukhalas', zamerla. Vidno bylo pri mesiatse ee belye zuby - kholodnye i okhlazhdaiushchie telo i to zhe telo, kak zuby, no teploe i

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 77; 1968, p. 67
Pakhlo iz teplushek bol'nym potom, pelenkami i podle vagonov gusto pakhli ammiakom rastoptannye isprazhneniia.
1954, p. 12
Pakhlo iz teplushek potom, pelenkami.
and 1922, p. 88; 1968, p. 91
I telegi, kazalos', tozhe vspoteli, stisnutye bushuiushchim chelovecheskim miasom. Vyrosshie iz borod mutno krasnymi poloskami guby blesteli na solntse sliunoi.
1954, p. 36
I telegi, kazalos', tozhe vspoteli, stisnutye bushuiushchimi liud'mi.

vzdragivaiushchee.

1954, p. 77

Opiat' prishla zhena: soskuchilas', bednaia! [1]

ORNAMENTALIST TROPES

A) Changes incorporated both in the 1954 and 1968 texts

Revisions in this group affect primarily the narrator's depiction of characters and setting. In places where the original narration displays colourfulness and vividness, the revised texts appear impoverished and dull. This may be illustrated by the following example where the original ornamentalist depiction of captain Nezelasov is removed in the newer versions.

1922, p. 75

Nezelasov byl shirokii, no ploskii chelovek, pokhozhii na list bumagi: sboku - nitka,

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 116; 1968, p. 125
Za kustarnikami lesa i vsegda neozhidanno tolstye, temno-zelenye sopki, pokhozhie na grudi.
1954, p. 70
Za kustarnikami - lesa i vsegda neozhidanno tolstye temnozelenye sopki.

v grudi - versta.[1]

1954, p. 9; 1968, p. 64

- - -

The revisions which were imposed in the area of setting result in dullness and they deprive the story of its original lyricism.

1922, p. 79

O pesni sheburshali sukhie travy.[2]

1954, p. 17; 1968, p. 71

- - -

B) Changes incorporated only in the 1954 text

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 76
Byl on [Obab] uzkoglazyi, s vydaiushchimisia skulami, pokhozhimi na oblomki rzhanogo sukharia.
1954, p. 11
- - -
1968, p. 65
Vzdokhnuli plotnye, ostrye skuly, pokhozhie na oblomki rzhanogo sukharia.
and 1922, p. 124
I tol'ko neponiatno, kak nevedomye rudy, blesteli u nikh [u priiskovykh] okruglennye, privykshie k kamniu glaza.
1954, p. 81; 1968, p. 137
Blesteli u nikh okruglennye, privykshie k kamniu glaza.

[2] Cf. 1922, p. 110
Gudela v lesu zemlia.
1954, p. 61; 1968, p. 116
Gudeli v lesu rel'sy.
and 1922, p. 110
Shpala plakala.
1954, p. 62
- - -
1968, p. 117
Rel's plakal.

In the depiction of both characters and setting, ornamentalist features were still further reduced in the 1954 edition.

Among the changes affecting characters is one which deletes ornamentalist features in depicting the Chinese partisan Sin-Bin-U while awaiting the train on the rails:

1922, p. 110; 1968, p. 117

> Ploskaia izumradnaia, kak u kobry, golova poshchupala shpaly ...
> ... I eshche potianulas' izumrudnaia kobra - vverkh ...

1954, p. 62

> Golova ego poshchupala shpaly ...
> ... I eshche potianulas' golova - vverkh ... [1]

The deletion of this animalist-ornamentalist simile in the 1954 text has a special significance: it not only changes the style and flavour of the passage, it also

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 110; 1968, p. 116
Morshchilos', temnelo kak osenii list, litso zheltoe.
1954, p. 61
- - -
and 1922, p. 116; 1968, p. 125
... spiny, pokhozhie na kuski kory.
1954, p. 70
... spiny.
and 1922, p. 79; 1968, p. 70
Griaznye soldaty vytiagivalis' i morozili v led chetyrekhugol'nye litsa.
1954, p. 16
Griaznye soldaty vytiagivalis'.
and 1922, p. 93; 1968, p. 85
Plechi u nikh [u ofitserov] byli ustalo iskrivleny i chasto opuskalis' na glaza toshchie, tochno zadykhaiushchiesia veki.
1954, p. 30
Plechi u nikh ustalo iskrivleny ...

removes the potentially disparaging comparison involving Sin-Bin-U.

Ornamentalist revisions include also those which describe feelings and emotions. Alterations of this kind not only deprived the text of its original flavour but they also bring in simplicity and clarity while making the text less psychologically complex.

An example of such a change may be observed where the narrator depicts Nezelasov's emotions.

1922, p. 112; 1968, p. 119

I dolgo bilos' nuzhnoe slovo v nogakh, v loktiakh ruk, pokrytykh gusinoi kozhei.

1954, p. 65

> I odnako, nuzhnogo slova ne nakhodilos'. Kazalos' one drozhit v muskulakh nog, loktiakh ruk, pokrytykh gusinoi kozhei ... i net! [1]

Another group of changes in this section are those depicting the details in characters' movements and sensations comparing them to things. This type of change is evident in the following passage where the narrator describes Obab's movements:

1922, p. 100; 1968, p. 102

> Obab perevernulsia, pospeshno ubiraia spinu, kak ubiraiut rvanuiu podkladku plat'ia.

1954, p. 47

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 84; 1968, p. 78
Ot plotno sbivshikhsia tel shla mutivshaia golovu teplota i podymalas' s nog do golovy sukhaia znobivshaia zlost'
1954, p. 24
Ot plotno sbivshikhsia tel shla mutivshaia golovu teplota.
and 1922, p. 77; 1968, p. 67
Oshchushchenie styda, i dalekoi, kakoi-to taiashcheisia v nogakh zlosti, ne prokhodilo.
1954, p. 13
Oshushchenie styda i neulovimoi zlosti ne ostyvalo.
and 1922, p. 93; 1968, p. 85
Znobov dumal o iapontsakh i, vychesyvaia zapadaiushchie gluboko mysli, otvetil nemnogo toroplivo:
1954, p. 31
Znobov dumal o iapontsakh i otvetil nemnogo toroplivo:
and 1922, p. 95; 1968, p. 88
Peklevanov zakhokhotal kakim-to pestrym smekhom.
1954, p. 33
Peklevanov, ulybaias', laskovo vzglianul na nego i skazal:

Obab povernulsia, pospeshno ubiraia spinu. [1]

The 1954 edition brought about further changes regarding the setting which has been reduced in vividness through the deletion of ornamentalist similes and metaphors.

The following passage clearly demonstrates such a change in describing the city scene:

1922, p. 92; 1968, p. 83

... na zveniashchie vagony tramvaev i besstrastnye golubovato-zheltye kofty ...

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 82; 1968, p. 74
... i muzhiki chrez prosvety derev'ev plyli glazami tuda, a potom vzdykhali ...
1954, p. 20
Muzhiki vzdykhali.
and 1922, p. 100; 1968, p. 102
... i mutno i obtrepanno gliadeli glaza ...
1954, p. 47
... i mutno gliadeli glaza ...
and 1922, p. 104; 1968, p. 108
... krepko postaviv, budto prishiv nogi mezhdu shpal na zemliu, ...
1954, p. 53
... krepko postaviv nogi mezhdu shpal na zemliu, ...
and 1922, p. 93; 1968, p. 85
Eli glaza, kak rastvor myla, piatna domov, polurazrushennykh vo vremia vosstanii.
1954, p. 30
Glaza s bol'iu smotreli na doma, polurazrushennye vo vremia vosstaniia.
and 1922, p. 76; 1968, p. 65
Zametiv na sebe rykhlyi zrachok Nezelasova, praporshchik skazal: ...
1954, p. 11
Zametiv na sebe ustalyi vzgliad Nezelasova, praporshchik skazal: ...
and 1922, p. 80; 1968, p. 72
Shestoi den's korotkimi otdykhami, pokhozhimi na molitvu, dve sotni partizan ...
1954, p. 18
Shestoi den's korotkimi otdykhami dve sotni partizan ...

1954, p. 29

... zveniashchie vagony tramvaev i golubovato-zheltye korotkie kofty ... [1]

OSTRANENIE

A) Changes incorporated both in the 1954 and 1968 texts

The changes in this category are characterized by reducing or entirely removing the essential unfamiliarity from the depiction of persons and objects. As pointed out earlier, [2] the revisions in this group include also those which reduce the original fragmentation of the plot and action. These revisions materialize chiefly through textual alterations as well as through the expansion of sentences and addition cf new passages. Following such changes the text becomes increasingly informative and provides a motivation for character' actions and behaviour which is absent in the original.

An example of such a change may be seen in the expansion of Obab's speech when speaking to Nezelasov:

1922, p. 75

Bolezn'. (Obab)

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 110; 1968, p. 117
Seroi plesen'iu podernulos' nebo, kak goluboe sukno byli derev'ia.
1954, p. 62
Seroi plesen'iu podernulos' nebo.
and 1922, p. 110; 1968, p. 117
Sliuniavilas' trava, sliuniavilos' nebo.
1954, p. 62
- - -

[2] See Chapter I, pp. 8-9 of this study.

1954, p. 10; 1968, p. 64

Bolezn'. U nas. Vot ataman Semenov. Ne mozguet. B'et. (Obab) [1]

An extensive textual addition may be observed in the first chapter of the story. At this point a lengthy passage has been inserted into the text. This additional material contains a dialogue between Nezelasov and an old fugitive. In this dialogue references are made to Vershinin and his partisans which have a clarifying effect on the initial chapter.

Nezelasov's untruthful statement regarding Vershinin

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 78
- - -
1954, p. 14; 1968, p. 68
Vershinin podkhodit. (bezhenka)
and 1922, p. 78
- - -
1954, p. 15; 1968, p. 69
Vershinin ... Oni... (bezhenka)
and 1922, p. 93
Nado. (matros)
1954, p. 31; 1968, p. 86
Valiaite. Vershinin kak myslit? (matros)
Vershinin - tuda, kuda veter - tam i on s dozhdem. Kuda muzhiki - znachit, i Vershinin. (Znobov)
and 1922, p. 75
1954, p. 10
Nezelasov terebil seruiu rykhluiu bumagu telegrammy. Kak vezde, na telegramme tsifry. Kak vsegda, mutneiut zrachki Obaba:
- Opiat'? (Obab)
- Chto opiat'?.. V chem delo? (Nezelasov)
1968, p. 65
Nezelasov terebil seruiu rykhluiu bumagu telegrammy. Kak vezde, na telegramme - tsifry. Kak vsegda, mutneiut zrachki Obaba. Sliuniav khlopaiushchii golos:
- Opiat'? (Obab)
- Chto opiat'?.. V chem delo? (Nezelasov)

serves yet another purpose, e.g., it adds a negative quality to Nezelasov by showing him to be a liar.

1922, p. 77

- - -

1954, p. 13; 1968, p. 67

Starik, ne opuskaia koluna, chut' chut' pokachal golovoi. (Kak-to plechami) ostro i so svistom vzdokhnul:
- Daleko ... Govoriat na putiakh-to, vashblago, Vershinin iavilsia.
- Nepravda. Nikogo net. (Nezelasov)
- Nu? Znachit vrut! - (starik)
Starik ozhivlenno vzmakhnul kolunom. - A govoriat, idet i rezhet. Besposhchadno. Dazhe skot. Odna, govoriat, nadezhda na bronipoezdu. (Tol'kol Ish' ty ... Znachit, netu?
- Nikogo net...
- Sovsem, vashblago, prekrasno. Mozhe, i do Vladivostoku doberesh'sia ... Prozhivem. Kudy ia obrat' poprus', skazhi-ka ty mne?
- Ne vyderzhish' ... Ty ne bespokoisia ... Da. [1]

In the first chapter, still another lengthy addition may be observed, a change that indicates the extensive volume and severe character of the revisions which were made in this category. In contrast to the ostranenie in the original version, the additional information provides smoothness of narrative exposition and markedly increases textual clarity.

1922, p. 79

- - -

1954, pp. 15-16; 1968, pp. 69-70

Opiat' prinesli telegrammu. Kto-to,

---

[1] The text in parentheses appears only in the 1968 edition.

nerazborchivo i nepremenno priputyvaia tsifry. prikazyval razognat' bandy Vershinina, sobiraiushchiesia po linii zheleznoi dorogi. I v kontse govorilos' o kakikh-to iapontsakh, ital'iantsakh...

- Telegramma nomer dvenadtsat' tysiach piat' - sot sorok odin, vidite!.. Prikaz, praporshchik, prikaz, govoriu ... A kto tam, kto smeet prikazyvat'? Kto est'? (Nezelasov)

Dobrodushnyi tolstyi parovoz, obleqchenno vzdykhaia, podtashchil k perronu shest' vagonov iaponskikh soldat. Za nim drugoi. Malen'kie chisten'kie liudi, pokhozhie na zheltogolovykh ptichek, porkhali po perronu.

Kapitana Nezelasova nashel iaponskii ofitser v parovoze bronepoezda. Poglazhivaia koburu revol'vera i chut' shevelia loktiami, iaponets miagko govoril po-russki, staraias' iasno vygovarivat' bukvu "r":

- Ia est' pol-rr-liuchik Tanako Mutstso ... Tia. Ia est' koman-n-til-l-rr-lovan vmeste.

I, vnezapno povyshaia golos, vykriknul ochevidno tverdo zauchennoe:

- Unichtozhit!.. Unichtozhit!..

Riadom s nim stoial amerikanskii korrespondent vo frenche s blestiashchimi zelenymi pugovitsami i v polosatykh chulkakh. On bystro, tozhe zauchenno, ogliadyval stantsiiu i, toroplivo chirkaia karandashom, sprashival:

- A etta?.. A etta?.. Sh-Sh-to?..

Obab i eshche kakoi-to ofitser, poteia i kashlaia, ob'iasniali.

- Khorosho, - skazal Nezelasov. - Prikazhite, Obab, pritsepit' vagony ... s iapontsami.

On zakhlopnul tiazheluiu stal'nuiu dver'. [1]

Besides removing the original stylistic quality, the additional text, by enhancing the courage and heroism of the partisans and by increasing the numerical strength of the enemy soldiers, also expresses ideological orthodoxy which

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 95
Iapontsev sorok. (Peklevanov)
1954, p. 33; 1968, p. 88
Iapontsev sorok. Sorok tysiach. (Peklevanov)

is absent in the original. At the same time the Japanese are ridiculed through their speech and the narrator refers to them as "malen'kie chisten'kie liudi, pokhozie na zheltogolovykh ptichek..."

In the second chapter a textual addition may be observed at the end of the third part:

1922, p. 83

- - -

1954, p. 22; 1968, p. 77

Starik bespokoino pochesalsia.
- Ish', i sobaka s toski sdokhla, Nikita Egorych.
A chelovek terpit. (starik)
- Terpit, Egorych. Branepoias-to v sopki poidet, baiut, iznichtozhit vse i opiat'-taki pozhget. (starik)
- Narodu ne govori zria. Nado v gory rel'sy. (Vershinin)
Starik zlobno spliunul.
- Bez rel'sy poidet. Raz oni s iapontsem sviazalis'.
Iaponets da amerikanka vse mozhet. Pogibel' nasha iavilas', Egorych. Priamo pogibel'. Narod-to, kak urozhai pod dozhdem, ginet ... A kapitan-to etot s branepoiasa iz tsarskikh rodov budet?.. (starik)
- Budet tebe zria-to... (Vershinin)
- Zol uzh, i rostu, baiut, vyshe sazheni, a

borodishcha-to... [1] (starik)

This additional text again increases both the fluency of the plot and clarity of related episodes. This may be seen in the speech of the old peasant who refers to a previously mentioned death of a dog. Furthermore the references to the armored train, to captain Nezelasov and to his alliance with the American and Japanese detachments, all absent in 1922, run counter to the ostranenie principle of the original text. At the same time this textual addition has an ideological function in that it provides more for Vershinin to overcome, i.e., backwardness among the peasant masses, especially the older ones.

Another textual addition may be observed at the end of part XVII (original chapter V, part II) where the narrator's additional statement makes the ending more informative by referring to Sin-Bin-U spying on the enemy, and makes the

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 94
Zhdat' nadoelo. Khuzhe rvoty.
Streliai po poezzdam, zhgi, kazakov bei...
(Znobov)
1954, p. 32; 1968, p. 86
Zhdat' nadoelo. Khuzhe rvoty. Streliai po poezdam, zhgi, kazakov bei... Bronepoezd tut. Iaponets chisto ogon' - ne razbirat; vse zhget. (Znobov)

Cf. also chapter IX in both of the revised texts where Znobov's expanded statement in the dialogue with Peklevanov has a clarifying effect through providing more information about the intended city uprising:
1922, p. 94
Nu-u? (Znobov)
1954, p. 33; 1968, p. 87
- Nu-u? ... A sorvetsia opiat' Vy verite uzhe... (Znobov)

chapter ending less abrupt than the original:

1922, p. 98

Zhit'ishko! - skazal on liubovno. (soldatik)

1954, p. 45; 1968, p. 99

Zhit'ishko! - skazal on liubovno. (soldatik) Kitaets v gaolianakh govoril chto-to shepotom rusoglazomu parniu. [1]

In the final part of the story a deletion in the narrator's speech results in removing the effect of ostranenie and stikhiinost' in the depiction of the peasant masses. This was done by removing the simile "kak nevedomye rudy" which indicates the unknown or unpredictable quality of the peasant movement.

1922, p. 124

I tol'ko neponiatno, kak nevedomye rudy, blesteli u nikh okruglennye, privykshie k kamniu glaza.

1954, p. 81; 1968, p. 137

Blesteli u nikh okruglennye, privykshie k kamniu glaza.

Another clarifying revision may be seen in the first

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 123
Proveli tolpu ofitserov v podval. Ni odin iz nikh ne zametil lezhavshii u lestnitsy trup generala.

1954, p. 80; 1968, p. 136
Proveli tolpu ofitserov v podval. Ni odin iz nikh ne zametil lezhavshego u lestnitsy trupa generala.
Soldatik v golubykh obmotkakh i butsakh podumal sentimental'no, chto khorosho b krasnoi podkladkoi shineli prikryt' trup geroia.
No geroi zakopay v gaolianakh.

chapter where in an added dialogue between Nézelasov and Obab, the former makes continual references to Vershinin and his partisans.

1922, p. 76

- - -

1954, p. 11

Za spasitelei nas schitaiut... Eruslany!
(Nezelasov)
V telegramme pishut: u rel'sov vershininskii
otriad pokazalsia ... v gorode... (Nezelasov)
Obab gruzno otodvinulsia ot okna.
Zhidy, kapitan. I v gorode - zhidy,
i u Vershinina - zhidy. Daite tsigaretu.
(Obab)
- Pridut iapontsy pomogat', a nado do nikh
pokazat' ... (Nezelasov)

In the 1968 version which remains essentially the same as the 1954 text, a return to somewhat less clarity and explicitness may be observed in Nezelasov's utterance.

1968, p. 65

Za spasitelei nas schitaiut ... Eruslany!
V telegramme pishut: u rel'sov vershininskii
otriad pokazalsia ... v gorode... (Nezelasov)
Obab gruzno otodvinulsia ot okna.
Zhidy, kapitan. I v gorode - zhidy, i u
Vershinina - zhidy. Daite tsigaretu. (Obab)

- Pridut iapontsy... (Nezelasov) [1]

At the beginning of the seventh chapter a textual change may be observed which has a clarifying effect upon the episode in which it appears:

1922, p. 111

> Razyskivaia v parovoznom instrumente zubilo, uzkogorlyi zashib golovu i vdrug ne ot boli zakrichal.

1954, p. 63

> Razyskivaia v parovoznom instrumente zubilo, uzkogorlyi artillerist zashib golovu i vdrug ot boli zakrichal.

1968, p. 118

> Razyskivaia v parovoznom instrumente zubilo, uzkogorlyi zashib golovu i vdrug ot boli zakrichal.

The addition of the noun "artillerist" identifies more closely this particular character. In the original, ostranenie may be seen in the soldier's exclamation for no apparent reason whereas now the removal of the negative particle in the second part of the sentence, provides an

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 76
Portiatsia liudi, - podumal Obab. Emu zakhotelos' zhenit'sia ... On spliunul v platok, skazal: Erunda. (Obab)

1954, p. 10

Portiatsia liudi, - podumal Obab, - Khorosho by zhenit'sia. V sem'iu by khorosho... (Obab) On spliunul v platok i skazal: Erunda. Mysli! (Obab)

1968, p. 65
Portiatsia liudi, - podumal Obab. Emu zakhotelos' zhenit'sia. V sem'iu by khorosho ... On spliunul v platok i skazal: Erunda. (Obab)

everyday explanation.

B) Changes incorporated only in the 1954 text

Ostranenie was still further reduced in the 1954 version. This may be seen in extensions of both the narrator's and characters' speech. Among such additions are those which identify characters and places:

1922, 80; 1968, p. 71

I telo u nikh bylo, kak ...

1954, p. 17

I telo partizan bylo kak ... [1]

In other instances the revisions have had a clarifying effect on characters' actions. This may be observed in the episode where Obab dies, shot by the partisans:

1922, p. 11; 1968, p. 117

Praporshchik Obab ostalsia lezhat' u nasypi, v travakh.

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 90; 1968, p. 94
Im vidnee, - nekhotia otvetil Vershinin.
1954, p. 39
Im vidnee, - nekhotia otvetil Vershinin, - iapontsam-to.
and 1922, p. 94; 1968, p. 86
Proidet. (Peklevanov)
1954, p. 32
Iaponsty uidut. Ugonim. (Peklevanov)
and 1922, p. 104; 1968, p. 107
Obozhdi. Ne orali esche. (Vershinin)
1954, p. 52
Obozhdi. Ne orali eshche. Narodu poorat' nado. (Vershinin)
and 1922, p. 81; 1968, p. 74
Pylyokha-o ... (Sin-Bin-U)
1954, p. 20
Pylyokha-o! Zdes'. Doma khorosho. (Sin-Bin-U)

1954, p. 63

> Praporshchik Obabo stalsia lezhat' u nasypi, v travakh, mertvyi.

A substantial stylistic change may also be seen in chapter VII in the episode where the narrator depicts Nezelasov's movements while commanding the armored train. The original at this point is unusual in its use of prepositions while the 1954 text is clear and more ordinary in its use of appropriate verbs with the prepositions.

1922, p. 111; 1968, p. 117

> Kapitan Nezelasov byl v kupe, v parovoze, po vagonam.

1954, p. 63

> Kapitan Nezelasov byl v kupe, pobezhal na parovoz, oboshel vagony.

Ostranenie has also been removed in an episode where the narrator depicts the peasant masses. Here one notes the deletion of the narrator's original reifying of the peasants who are referred to as a "polotno", and a "droning" one at that.

1922, p. 103; 1968, p. 107

> Mezhdu vykrashennykh pod zoloto i krasnuiu med' osennikh derev'ev natianulos' griaznoe, pakhnuvshee zemlei, polotno iz muzhitskikh tel. Polotno gudelo. I bylo neponiatno - ne to serdito, ne to radostno gudit ono ot slov chelovechkov, govoriashchikh s telegi.

1954, p. 52

> Mezhdu okrashennykh pod zoloto i krasnuiu med' osennikh derev'ev - tysiachi plotno stoiashchikh i tiazhelo dyshavshchikh liudei. I bylo neponiatno - ne to serdito, ne to

radostno gudiat oni ot slov tekh, kto govorit
s telegi.

A change concerning the partisans may also be found in the episode following the defeat of the armored train. While providing referential clarity, the 1954 text negates the stikhiinost' of the partisan movement brought up originally in "A grozit' vsegda nado!":

1922, p. 119; 1968, p. 130

Odin v krasnoi rubakhe kulakom grozit:
- My tebe pokazhem! (partizan)
Komu, kto?
Neizvestno!
A grozit' vsegda nado!

1954, p. 75

Odin v krasnoi rubakhe kulakom grozit:
- My tebe pokazhem! (partizan)
Komu? Kto?
Grozit vragu vsegda nado! Nado!

The 1954 text contains another extensive addition which may be seen in chapter I, part VII. As already documented on page 29 of this study, this particular addition increases textual clarity and adds motivating material to the plot in that it serves to account for Vershinin's fierce determination to fight the enemy.

IDEOLOGICAL ORTHODOXY

A) Changes incorporated both in the 1954 and 1968 texts

Among the changes recorded in this section are those which enhance the role of the Communist Party and improve the image of its representatives. This type of revision is evident in the following passage which marks an occasion

where Socialist Realist political orthodoxy has been brought into the story by expressing the ideological commitment and personal bravery of the city leader Peklevanov. The new material also points to the connection and cooperation between the peasant partisans and the city workers as well as the friendship and solidarity between the two leaders, Vershinin and Peklevanov.

1922, p. 115

- - -

1954, p. 70; 1968, p. 124

> Na rassvete priekhal Peklevanov. V portfele u nego lezhali proklamatsii, i odno steklo ochkov bylo slomano napolovinu. [1]

In the political determination, self-discipline and toughness, added to Peklevanov's characterization, one can recognize an effort to portray Peklevanov as a "positive hero". The same to a lesser extent, may be said about the depiction of Vershinin. However, it should be pointed out that neither of these characters is central enough to be

---

[1] cf. 1922, p. 94
Prekrasno. (Peklevanov)
1954, p. 32; 1968, p. 86
Prekrasno. Initsiativu nuzhno, nuzhno. Chudesno! Poshlem. Cheloveka i dinamit. Deistvuite.
(Peklevanov giving orders to partisans)
and 1922, p. 106
Ne pushchu. - Kto mne potom tebia vozvratit, kogda rasstreliaiut? Partiia? Revkom? Naplevat' mne na nikh vsekh, idiotov! (Masha)
1954, p. 55; 1968, p. 110
Ne pushchu ... Kto mne potom tebia vozvratit, kogda rasstreliaiut? Revkom? Naplevat' mne na nikh vsekh, idiotov! (Masha)

defined as a "clear cut" positive hero[1] a situation that is a carryover from Ivanov's original preoccupation with "spontaneous", primitive peasant masses.

The role of the city party organization has also been enhanced through a compositional change that involves chapters III and IV of the original story. These chapters, i.e., their corresponding parts have been switched around in both of the revised versions as follows:

1922

Chapter III, part I, pp. 87-88 becomes Part XIV,
pp. 35-37 (1954)
pp. 90-92 (1968)

Chapter III, Part II, pp. 89-90 becomes Part XV,
pp. 37-39 (1954)
pp. 92-94 (1968)

Chapter III, Part III, pp. 90-91 becomes Part XVI,
pp. 40-41 (1954)
pp. 94-95 (1968)

Chapter III, Part IV, p. 91 becomes Part XIII,
p. 35 (1954)

---

[1] Soviet literature prides itself on portraying commoners, but it tends to cast some of them in the official image of the idealized positive hero. This hero, usually a central character in the story, is invested with the virtues appropriate to a given situation, including the correct approach to any problem. An analysis of such a hero will reveal the same repertoire of politically efficacious moral qualities: loyalty, resourcefullness, steadfastness, vigilance, and, whenever they are called for, ruthlessness and intolerance.

pp. 89-90 (1968)

Chapter IV, Part I, pp. 91-93 becomes Part X,

pp. 28-31 (1954)

pp. 83-86 (1968)

Chapter IV, Part II, pp. 93-95 becomes Part XI,

pp. 31-34 (1954)

pp. 86-89 (1968)

Chapter IV, Part III, pp. 95-96 becomes Part XII,

pp. 34-35 (1954)

p. 89 (1968)

At first, there seems to be no apparent reason for this compositional rearrangement but after a closer examination the following implication may be observed: in both of the revised versions it is not a mass decision to attack the armored train and help the city uprising as it was in the original chapter III, Part II, page 89 and Chapter IV, Part III, page 91. For now the order has been received from the city party organization in the revised Part XI, pages 32-33 and Part VIII, page 35 of the 1954 version.

Among changes included in this section are also those which improve the image of the partisans both by enhancing their positive qualities, such as heroism and respectability, and by deleting their negative features such as cowardice and backwardness. Such an effort is demonstrated in the situation where the narrator ascribes to Vershinin a negative dehumanizing thought regarding his partisans:

1922, p. 91

I ot krika etogo pochustvoval sebia soldatom i podvlastnym mashinkam, pokhozhim na liudei.

1954, p. 40; 1968, p. 95

I ot krika etogo pochuvstvoval sebia soldatom. [1]

Additionally, optimism in the partisans and revolutionaries has been consistently increased in both of the revised texts. This is evident from the dialogue between Znobov and Vershinin regarding the future life after the revolution. Znobov's optimism is observable in both of the newer texts:

1922, p. 104

- Budut zhe posle nas liudi khorosho zhit'? (Vershinin)
- Nu? (Znobov)
- Vot i vse. (Vershinin)
Znobov razvel pal'tsami usy i skazal s udovol'stviem:
- Eto - ikh delo. (Znobov)

1954, p. 53

- Budut zhe posle nas liudi khorosho zhit'? (Vershinin)
- Nu? (Znobov)
- Vot i vse. (Vershinin)
Znobov razvel pal'tsami usy i skazal s udovol'stviem;
- Eto - ikh delo. Ia dumaiu: obiazany! (Znobov)

1968, p. 108

- Budut zhe liudi posle nas khorosho zhit'? (Vershinin)

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 115
Partizany opiat' otstupili.
1954, p. 70; 1968, p. 124
Partizany otstupili.

- Nu? (Znobov)
- Vot i vse.
Znobov razvel pal'tsami usy i skazal s udovol'stviem:
- Eto ikh delo. Ia dumaiu, obiazany, stervy! [1]

A change which enhances the positive nature and simplicity of the story may also be observed when comparing the original ending to that of the revised texts. The original at this point shows the "little soldier in the blue puttees" expressing his view of the revolution through the narrator's speech. The soldier's opinion is neither positive nor negative and its deletion in both of the revised texts thus removes the original objectivity.

1922, p. 124

I bylo emu neponiatno stydno ne to za sebia, ne to za amerikantsa, ne to za Rossiiu, ne to za Evropu.

1954, p. 82

A partizany shli i shli...

1968, p. 137

- - -

In the revised texts ideological orthodoxy may also be seen where the enemy characters are concerned. Revisions of this type are demonstrated by a harsher attitude between the

---

[1] Cf. Vershinin's thoughts concerning his wife and the troubled times:

1922, p. 82
Mnogoe bylo neponiatno - i zhena, kak v molodosti, ne zhelala imet' rebenka.

1954, p. 21; 1968, p. 75
Mnogoe bylo neponiatno, i zhena, kak v molodosti, zhelala imet' rebenka.

two sides. This point is well illustrated by the scene where the partisans capture an American soldier. Through changes in the narrator's speech the partisans' compassion has been removed. Originally, the peasants, in spite of their initial wrath, took interest in getting through to the American.

1922, p. 85

Muzhiki, medlenno i slovno vinovato, otoshli ot amerikantsa.

1954, p. 25; 1968, p. 80

Muzhiki otoshli ot amerikantsa.

B) Changes incorporated only in the 1954 text

Revisions in the 1954 text include references to religion. This is demonstrated on the occasion where Znobov and the partisans are trying to convert the American soldier to the proletarian cause.

1922, p. 85; 1968, p. 80

Naidennye knizhki byli vse russkie.

1954, p. 26

Naidennye knizhki byli vse tserkovnye. [1]

"Tserkovnye" replaces "russkie" in reference to the books and this is understandable in light of Znobov's following remark:

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 80; 1968, p. 72
Shestoi den' s korotkimi otdykhami, pokhozhimi na molitvu, dve sotni partizan, prikrivaia ...

1954, p. 18
Shestoi den' s korotkimi otdykhami, dve sotni partizan, prikryvaia ...

1922, p. 85; 1968, p. 80; 1954, p. 26

Tol'ko na raskurku i godny, ...

The 1954 text observes the official political line of the early 1950's. This may be seen in the scenes refering to various nationalities. In the following example one observes a deletion of a negative remark about the Chinese. This change reflects the Stalinist political orthodoxy of the early 1950's when good Russian-Chinese relations were maintained.

1922, p. 78; 1968, p. 68

Kitaets, tak tot sovsem iazyka russkogo ne ponimaet. I kak zhivet. Bog ego znaet! Pal'shivo zhivet. (starik)

1954, p. 13

- - -

Ideological orthodoxy brought about further negative changes at points where reference is made to western countries and individuals. For example, in the scene where Znobov refers favourably to America, the 1954 edition has deleted the part of his speech which contains the positive comparison:

1922, p. 93; 1968, p. 86

Eto verno. Domov iz takogo kamniu khoroshikh mozhno nabukhat'. Priamo - Amerika. (Znobov)

1954, p. 31

Eto verno. Domov iz takogo kamnia khoroshikh mozhno nabukhat'. (Znobov)

This negative attitude to western countries may also be seen

in a harsher depiction of an American journalist by the narrator in the 1954 version.

1922, p. 124; 1968, p. 137

> No byl tot gladok, skol'zok i neulovim. kak ryba v vode.

1954, p. 82

> No byl tot gadok, skol'zok i neulovim, kak ryba v vode.

Some of the most important changes in this group are those which enhance the political awareness of peasant revolutionaries as well as their positive attitude toward the future. So it is in the scene where in the original the "peasant in the red shirt" shows a certain disagreement and doubt regarding the revolution and the future. The corresponding passage in the 1954 version leaves out the statements of doubt and disagreement and it clearly displays the features of Socialist Realism, i.e., political conviction and ideological orthodoxy involving the leading role of Peklevanov, the city revolutionary.

1922, p. 90; 1968, p. 94

> Samo glavno v cheloveka poverit'...
> A internasynal-to? (muzhik)
> On podmignul i eshche tikho skazal:
> - Ia ved' znaiu - tam nichego netu. Za takim mudrenym slovom nikogda dobrogo ne naidesh'. Slovo dolzhno byt' prostoe, skazhem - pashnia ...
> Khoroshee slovo. (muzhik)
> - Nadoeli mne khoroshie slova. (Vershinin)
> - Breshchesh'. Tol'ko govoril i govorit' budesh'. Ty vbei im v golovu. A potom lishnee spriatat' mozhno ... Eto zavsegda tak delaetsia. Ved' kotoromu chelovku agromadneishaia mera nadobna, takoe plemia ... On tebe vershkom, sterva, merit' ne kochet, a

versta. I pus', pus', meriat ... Ty-to svoiu meru znash' ... Khe-khe-khe! ... (muzhik)
Muzhichonko po-svoiski khlopnul Vershinina v plecho.

1954, p. 40

Samoe glavnoe - v cheloveka poverit'... (muzhik)
Chelovek byvaet raznyi - skazal Vershinin, - a pravda odna... (Vershinin)
- Sovetskaia? - podkhvatil koriavyi Muzhichonka.
- Drugoi ne ishchem. (Vershinin)
- A ia kakuiu ishchu?.. Tu zhe samuiu! Chtob toi pravde chelovek vroven' byl. Ia tebia schitaiu ei vroven', Nikita Egorych! Ia schitaiu, ty im, muzhikam-to pravdu vo vsei krase raz'iasnit' mozhesh'! (muzhik)
- Khochu, da trudno, - skazal Vershinin.
- Neuchenoi ia. Malo v gorode ia zhil ... Vstrechalsia ia tam s nastoiashchim chelovekom - Peklevanov, Il'ia Gerasimych, predsedatel' revkoma ... da malo ... uchit'sia nam nado, okh, kak eshche uchit'sia... (Vershinin)
- Obuchimsia! (muzhik)
I muzhichonka po svoiski khlopnul Vershinina v plecho. [1]

The role of the Communist Party has been further enhanced through the revisions in the 1954 text. This feature may clearly be observed in the Znobov - Peklevanov dialogue where additions and alterations of their speech bring out the superiority of the party.

1922, p. 95; 1968, p. 88

Mir. Muzhik khochet. (Znobov)

---

[1] Cf. 1922, p. 82; 1968, p. 74
A kitaitsu Sin-Bin-U kazalos', chto muzhiki za rozovymi granitami na zapade zhelaiut uvidet' inoe, ozhidaemoe.
1954, p. 20
A kitaitsu Sin-Bin-u kazalos', chto muzhiki za rozovymi granitami na zapade uzhe vidiat inoe, ozhidaemoe.

- Es-erovshchiny v vas mnogo, tovarishch Znobov. Zemlei ot vas neset. (Peklavanov)
- Z ot vas kolbasoi. (Znobov)
- Peklevanov zakhokhotal kakim-to pestrym smekhom.
- Vodkoi popodchuiu, khotite? - predlozhil on.
- Tol'ko dolgo ne sidite i pravitel'stvo ne rugaite.

1954, p. 33

Mir, Obshchestvo. Da... Muzhik khochet voevat. (Znobov)
- Za russkuiu zemliu? (Peklevanov)
- Za zemliu! - otvetil Znobov. - I razmechet on i iapontsev i amerikantsev, i vsekh, kto na Dal'nyi Vostok iavilsia. No, konechno, Il'ia Gerasimych, gorod dolzhen derevniu podderzhat'. (Znobov)
- Partia podderzhit. A partia opiraetsia na ves' gorod. (Peklevanov)
- Nu, i khorosho! (Znobov)
Znobov zasiial.
Peklevanov, ulybaias', laskovo vzglianul na nego i skazal:
- Vodkoi popotchuiu, khotite? Tol'ko, chur, dolgo ne sidet' i belogvardeitsev gromko ne rugat'.

In this extensively altered form many features of Socialist Realism may be observed. These include clarity and explicitness at the expense of ostranenie and ornamentalism as well as political orthodoxy reflective of a much later period in the history of Soviet letters, e.g., the whole city being behind the Reds. Additionally, by substituting "belogvardeitsy" for "pravitel'stvo" a potentially embarrasing allusion to Stalinist oppression is avoided.

The courage and heroism of partisans are still further played up in the 1954 version. One way to achieve this effect was to add on to the number of enemies. This is evident from the scene where the peasants speak about their

meeting with the American detachment:

1922, p. 84; 1968, p. 78

> Khoteli starosti (staroste) otdat', a tut ish' - tselaia kompania. (muzhik) [1]

1954, p. 23

> Khoteli staroste otdat', a tut ish' - tselaia armiia! ... (muzhik)

As pointed out earlier, the 1954 text further enhances the heroism of the partisans in the episode where Vas'ka Okorok is ordered to leave his position on the rails and the Chinese partisan Sin-Bin-U dies instead.[2]

With this point the discussion of the significant changes in their respective categories can be terminated and one can turn to the final evaluation of these changes and their overall effect on the literary quality of the tale.

---

[1] The text in parentheses marks the difference appearing in the 1968 edition.

[2] See Chapter III, pp. 46-48 of this study.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF CHANGES AND THEIR OVERALL EFFECT ON "BRONEPOEZD 14-69".

The purpose of the final chapter of this study is to review and evaluate the changes which were discussed in the preceding chapter. On the basis of this evaluation we will attempt to assess the overall effect of these changes on the literary - artistic quality of the versions of Bronepoezd 14-69 in which these appear.

In order to present a well organized and proper evaluation of individual editions of the tale we will discuss the changes separately for each version.

According to our initial observations we are trying to prove that it was the 1952 revision that was the most damaging to the artistic quality and credibility of the tale. The 1954 edition will therefore be examined first and than it will be compared to the canonical (1968) version of Bronepoezd 14-69.

Our analysis has shown that there are one hundred eighteen significant textual changes in the 1954 edition of Bronepoezd 14-69. According to our classification these were broken further as follows:

1954 EDITION

Category of Change	Speech		Total
	Narrator	Characters	Number of Changes
1. Characterization	10	17	27
2. Naturalism	16	5	21
3. Ornamentalist Tropes	26	-	26
4. Ostranenie	15	10	25
5. Ideological Orthodoxy	10	9	19
Total Number of Changes in the 1954 Edition	77	41	118

The above table clearly demonstrates the extensive volume of changes appearing in the 1954 text. One should also note that while some of these changes affect only a single phrase, there are others which affect whole paragraphs, pages and chapters.

As indicated above, in the characterization category altogether twenty seven changes have been recorded in the 1954 edition of the tale. These changes range in importance from the trivial change of names and patronymics to those which alter significantly the nature of individual characters and damage the artistic quality of the story. The

primary example of such characterization change is Vas'ka Okorok. In the original story Okorok is shown as a weak man afraid of the terrible death under the wheels of the armored train. This particular episode in the 1922 version is natural, full of sincerity and true human emctions. The corresponding episode in the 1954 version is artificial and unconvinving.[1] At the same time, by the effort to improve Okorok's image, the depiction of Vershinin and Sin-Bin-U was damaged. Their utterances have a highly political ring, which sounds ridiculous at the scene depicting a tempestuous group of Siberian peasants getting ready to attack the enemy. Unfortunately, this is not the only incident whereby the depiction of characters has suffered. The severe 1952 revision affected also several other characters, e.g., Znobov, Peklevanov and various nameless figures of peasants, soldiers and partisans. While the image of the revolutionaries was improved, the White soldiers and their allies are depicted entirely negatively in the 1954 version. The chief example of such a revision is captain Nezelasov. The 1922 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 gives a subtle psychological portrayal of Nezelasov. A careful examination of his statements as they appear in the 1954 edition shows their severe truncation or total deletion. Such changes have seriously affected the portrayal of this character in playing down his insanity and thus causing a gross

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 46-48 of this study.

oversimplification of his depiction. Nezelasov's ensign Obab is also depicted far more negatively in the 1954 edition as compared to the original version of the tale. His relationship and attitude to Nezelasov is shown as increasingly disrespectful and he himself is an increasingly ridiculous and confused person. The same may be said about the portrayal of the White soldiers in general. The 1954 version highlights their confusion, fear, and their lack of discipline.

On the basis of this observation it may be concluded that the general trend in the 1954 edition is to improve the image of partisans and city revolutionaries and at the same time to lower the character of the Whites. This is done in such a manner that it markedly simplifies the characterization and lowers the credibility of the story.

As indicated heretofore, in the naturalism subcategory of ornamentalism altogether twenty one changes appear in the 1954 edition. These seriously affect the quality of style by removing the original ornamentalist-naturalist features. Above all, the recorded changes affect the narrator's speech which reflects negatively on the depiction of characters and setting. To demonstrate this negative effect of the 1952 revision, one can refer to reductions in the naturalist depiction of Znobov, Nezelasov, the partisans as a group, and the woman at the railway station as observed by Nezelasov. Eroticism in the 1954 edition was also reduced,

which may best be seen in the scene depicting the meeting between Vershinin and his wife.

The naturalist depiction of setting was also markedly truncated in the 1954 edition. This has seriously affected the literary quality of the tale in that the revised scenes ceased to convey the true essence of the depicted era, namely the horrors of the civil war. This type of revision may be seen in the depiction of the railway station.[1]

In concluding the discussion of the ornamentalist-naturalist category it may be said that the changes imposed in the 1954 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 reduced one of the important stylistic markers of early Soviet literature. Moreover, these changes also contributed to the break in the organic unity between the characters and setting of this tale and the period being depicted.

In the ornamentalist tropes subcategory the 1954 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 displays twenty six instances where the original ornamentalist figurative expressions were either deleted or severely truncated. In this particular category the revision affected solely the narrator's speech, and thus as in the naturalism category, the changes mostly concern the depiction of characters and setting. Among the individual characters whose depiction suffered in the 1952 revision is captain Nezelasov. The original version of

---

[1] See Chapter III, p. 55 of this study.

Bronepoezd 14-69 displays a fine ornamentalist portrayal of this particular character:

> Nezelasov byl shirokii, no ploskii chelovek, pokhozhii na list bumagi: sboku - nitka, v grudi - versta. [1]

This passage was totally deleted after the 1952 revision.[2] Other characters which were affected negatively by either removal or alteration of ornamentalist tropes include ensign Obab and the Chinese partisan Sin-Sin-U whose animalist-ornamentalist depiction was totally removed from the 1954 text.[3] It should be noted that most revisions in this category affected the depiction of characters as a group. Among entire groups of characters so affected are the preasant partisans, White soldiers, the Japanese, and the people in the city streets. By removing the original ornamentalist epithets and similes from their depiction the actants lose their former colourfulness and vividness.

Setting too has been deprived of its original lyricism and vividness. The deletion of ornamentalist tropes leaves the depiction of nature scenes colourless and ordinary when compared to the original. In summing up the discussion of the ornamentalist tropes category it may be said that the 1952 revision markedly reduced one of the most important stylistic markers of the period, characteristic of many works of the Serapion Brotherhood to which Ivanov belonged.

---

[1] B 14-69, 1922, p. 75.
[2] See B 14-69, 1954, p. 9.
[3] See Chapter III, p. 58 of this study.

In the ostranenie subcategory massive changes were recorded in the 1954 version of Bronepoezd 14-69. Above all, these changes enhance textual clarity and explicitness by both diminishing the original fragmentation of the plot through links between episodes, and by increasing character motivation. The "strange" depiction of persons and objects is reduced in both of the revised versions of Bronepoezd 14-69. This was done by lexical alterations and by inserting additional passages into the text. The total number of changes in the ostranenie subcategory found in the 1954 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 is twenty five. These changes affect the narrator's speech as well as the speech of the individual characters. Among the additions are several dialogues which affect significantly the artistic quality of the tale in that thye have a clarifying effect and they also affect the relationship among characters. The primary example of a change in character interelationships is the relationship of Obab to captain Nezelasov. While the 1922 version of the tale displays a fine example of ostranenie in the fragmented dialogue between these two characters, the 1954 version through its alterations and additional dialogues is explicit in showing the increased disrespect of Obab for his superior officer. This particular textual addition serves yet anothet clarifying purpose in that it provides additional information on Vershinin and his partisans.

The clarifying effect of changes in this group may also

be observed in instances where the original indefinite pronouns were replaced by proper nouns which thus identified the characters concerned.[1]

The 1952 revision also removed the "strange" depiction of characters especially in situations describing the peasant partisans. A major alteration of this kind affected seriously the narrator's depiction of the partisan detachment. In one particular instance the peasant partisans were referred to as a "droning canvas" in the original text. The corresponding 1954 passage displays complete alteration in the depiction of the peasants and has thus deprived the work of one of its outstanding occurences of ostranenie.[2]

Changes in this subcategory of ornamentalism include also those affecting the original lyrical spontaneity of the peasant movement. In the 1954 version the spontaneity of peasants was removed mainly by depicting them as more orderly and by showing their political awareness which was totally absent in the 1922 version of the tale. This lowers seriously the credibility and literary quality of the story.

In the ideological orthodoxy category altogether nineteen changes have been found in the 1954 version of Bronepoezd 14-69. Although the number of changes in this particular category is the lowest as compared to the other

---

[1] See Chapter III, p. 71 of this study.
[2] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

four categories, the changes in this particular group affected most seriously the credibility of the tale. One may also notice that many changes in the previously discussed categories, besides affecting the quality of style, have also an ideological connotation attached to them. This may best be demonstrated by the general effort to improve the image of revolutionaries by deleting various ornamentalist features from their depiction, and mainly those which made a negative comparison. The extent and importance of these changes were the reason for placing the ideolcgical orthodoxy category in the last place and thus assessing it as the most significant group of changes in the tale.

The changes recorded in this group, besides enhancing the positive outlook in the partisans and revolutionaries, have also affected the depiction of the Whites and their allies by depicting them in a much harsher light than in the 1922 version. Examples of this negative attitude include the American journalist depicted by the narrator in the final part of the story,[1] and the peasants' attitude towards the captured American soldier.[2] On the other hand, Peklevanov as the representative of the city party organization underwent changes that made his portrayal less ornamentalist but more authoritative. The 1954 edition enhances his personal bravery and leadership abilities.[3] Peklevanov is now shown

---

[1] See Chapter III, p. 81 of this study.
[2] Ibid., p. 79.
[3] Ibid., pp. 74, 82-83.

to be giving orders to partisans and thereby the role of the Communist Party is enhanced by improving the image of its major representative. This is done by deleting negative remarks directed at the Party, and also by recomposing chapters III and IV of the original story so that it is not the partisans' decision to attack the armored train and help the city uprising but the decision of the city party organization.[1]

In general, the negative effect of changes in this category stems from their disturbing the character-era equilibrium and their removing the relative political objectivity of the original narrative. The credibility of the 1954 edition of the tale was also markedly reduced by frequently having uneducated peasants mouth totally uncharacteristic politico-idoelogical utterances. The scenes affected in this manner are ridiculous. Thus revised, the story acquires Socialist-Realist features, e.g., political conviction, positive outlook and the superiority of the Communist Party, all of which were atypical of Ivanov's early writings.

The review of the changes found in the 1954 edition of the tale has indicated their seriousness and the extent to which they damaged the literary quality of the work. When comparing the 1954 edition with the 1968 canonical version

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 75-76 of this study.

of the story one notes that the quality of the latest version of the tale has improved through restoring many of the deletions and returning altered passages to their original form. The number of changes recorded in the 1968 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 is illustrated by the following table:

1968 EDITION

Category of Change	Speech		Total
	Narrator	Characters	Number of Changes
1. Characterization	3	9	12
2. Naturalism	3	1	4
3. Ornamentalist Tropes	5	-	5
4. Ostranenie	9	6	15
5. Ideological Orthodoxy	6	4	10
Total Number of Changes in the 1968 Edition	26	20	46

The above table clearly illustrates the lesser extent of changes in the 1934/1968 edition of Bronepoezd 14-69. While the 1954 version displays one hundred eighteen deletions, additions and alterations, in the 1968 version altogether only forty six significant changes have been found.

In the characterization category only twelve changes have been recorded. This means that of twenty seven changes existing in the 1954 edition, fifteen were restored to the original 1922 form. Characterization changes in the 1968 edition include those damaging to the depiction of Nezelasov, Obab and that of the White soldiers in general. Where partisans are concerned, changes may be observed which enhance their bravery and the effect here is equally damaging. Other changes in this category involve the deletion of obscenities from the speech of partisans and soldiers in order to meet general Socialist-Realist strictures against printing obscenities.

In the naturalism subcategory altogether four changes were found in the 1968 version of Bronepoezd 14-69. This compares very positively with the 1954 edition of the tale which displays twenty one changes in this category. In other words, seventeen changes were restored to the original 1922 form. Moreover, two of four changes are of minor importance because they manifest a partial restoration of naturalism.[1] The four changes affected the naturalist depiction of Znobov in the episode where he talks to the partisans, and to some extent the depiction of the woman in the railway station as observed by Nezelasov. There is another minor change which diminishes the naturalist effect of setting and a minor alteration which formally improves Okorok's utterance about

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 51-54 of this study.

the Japanese.[1] In general, it may be said that the extent of changes in the naturalism subcategory in the 1968 version manifests the improved quality of the canonical version of the tale in that it comes close to restoring the stylistico-thematic unity of the original.

Also in the ornamentalist tropes subcategory the majority of changes were restored to the original form in the 1968 version. Of the twenty six changes appearing in the 1954 version, twenty one changes were restored to the original 1922 form leaving only five changes in this particular group. This is especially obvious in the area of setting. In comparison with the 1954 edition of Bronepoezd 14-69 only one change in the depiction of setting remained in the canonical version of the tale; all other modified passages were given their original form. To a lesser degree the same may be said about the ornamentalist depiction of characters. Unfortunately, captain Nezelasov is the one character whose expressive depiction was not restored in the 1968 edition. Other changes appropriate to the 1968 version include those regarding the depiction of peasants and a change diminishing ornamentalism in the depiction of ensign Obab.

In concluding the discussion of the ornamentalist tropes subcategory, it should be pointed out that in this

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 51-52 of this study.

particular section the highest number of changes was restored to the original form.

The ostranenie subcategory displays fifteen changes in the 1968 text. Of the twenty five modifications in the text of the 1954 version, ten were restored to their original form, and thus the number of changes in this subcategory remained much higher than those in the previously discussed categories. In fact, the majority of important ostranenie changes were upheld by the 1968 edition. These may be identified as lengthy additions which provide motivation and remove the original fragmentation of the plot, i.e., serve a clarifying function.[1] At the same time, while serving to suppress the original spontaneity of the peasant movement,[2] these additions function as the vehicle for either improving the image of partisans and revolutionaries or for lowering the image of the Whites and their allies.

In short, the number of ostranenie changes found in the 1968 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 is quite extensive and these changes seriously affect the quality and style of the tale.

In the ideological orthodoxy category altogether ten changes appear in the 1968 version. The number of changes compares favourably with the 1954 edition where nineteen

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 64-68 of this study.
[2] Ibid., p. 68.

changes are recorded. Thus nine changes in the ideological orthodoxy category were restored to the original form but these generally do not include the changes enhancing the superiority of the Communist Party and that of the city revolutionaries over the peasant partisans. The 1968 edition softens somewhat the harsh attitude towards the western countries which is expressed in the 1954 edition of the tale. Among the more significant improvements in the 1968 edition are two major dialogues. The first one is the dialogue between Vershinin and the "peasant in the red shirt". This particular dialogue was severely revised in 1952 in order to bring in such Socialist Realist criteria, as political conviction and a positive outlook among the peasant masses. The 1968 edition restored this dialogue to the original 1922 form which conveys the little peasant's doubts and thus the true essence of the depicted era.[1] The second major improvement in the ideological orthodoxy category involves the dialogue between Znobov and Peklevanov. In the 1954 edition this particular dialogue is substantially expanded and altered. These alterations bring out the superiority of the Communist Party and the political conviction of revolutionaries. In the 1968 version this dialogue is restored to the original form which is natural and reflective of the period depicted.

In summing up the discussion of this particular

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 81-82 of this study.

category it should be pointed out that the 1968 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 manifests some improvements as compared to the 1954 edition. However, as in the ostranenie subcategory the number of changes in the ideological orthodoxy group is quite extensive and the changes upheld in the 1968 edition reflect still quite negatively on the artistic quality and credibility of the story. The number of restorations in the ostranenie and ideological orthodoxy categories is much lower than in the other three categories. This constitutes another reason why the changes in these two categories were rated as the most important to the artistic-literary quality of the tale. The final distribution of changes in the 1954 and 1968 editions may be illustrated as follows:

Category of Change	1954 Edition	Changes restored	1968 Edition
1. Characterization	27	15	12
2. Naturalism	21	17	4
3. Ornamentalist Tropes	26	21	5
4. Ostranenie	25	10	15
5. Ideological Orthodoxy	19	9	10
Total Number of Changes	118	72	46

The above table manifests the difference in the extent of the 1934/1968 and 1952 revisions. The 1968 canonical version

of Bronepoezd 14-69 compares favourably with the 1954 edition because almost two thirds of the changes found in the 1954 text were restored to the original 1922 form.

With the above observation, the evaluation of the revisions found in the 1954 and 1934/1968 versions of Bronepoezd 14-69 is concluded. This quantitative and qualitative analysis of changes, based on the findings manifested in Chapter III of this study, serves as the basis for the final evaluation of the 1922, 1954 and the 1934/1968 versions of the tale. The general conclusion with regard to artistic quality of the three versions is the following:

The original version contains the full scale of the writer's literary devices characteristic for the period. His original inspiration was not yet trammelled by obedience to official politico-ideological standards; consequently, at least from the standpoint of the literary scholar, this version is the best version of the work. This is so because it conveys to the reader the true and natural spirit of the early Soviet period, its people and the circumstances in which they lived, fought and died. When the original version is juxtaposed with the 1954 version, it becomes obvious that criteria of Socialist Realism - positive hero, partiinost', ideinost', narodnost',[1] class consciousness and antagonism which materialize in a "black and white" portrayal of the

---

[1] For the explanation of these terms see Chapter I, p. 17 and Chapter III, p. 75 of this study.

characters - govern this text while causing serious damage to its credibility and artistic quality.

However, when comparing the 1922 and 1954 versions with the 1968 canonical version, one will come to the realization that many changes or deletions manifested in thhe 1954 edition are restored to their original form in the 1968 version of the tale.[1] Thus the work regained many of its original qualities. The above facts constitute the reason for rating the 1968 version of Bronepoezd 14-69 second to the original, while the 1954 edition is a distant third.

As pointed out in the opening chapter of this study, Bronepoezd 14-69 is one of many works of Soviet literature which underwent significant contextual revisions. This fact should be kept in mind when one is preparing to undertake the study of early Soviet literary works. The above point of view is expressed by L. N. Smirnova in her article Kak sozdavalsia "Tsement".[2] Here Smirnova calls for scholarly editions of Soviet works from the 1920's which would include the original text and any major subsequent revisions. This, she maintains, and we concur, would prevent scholars and literary critics from making serious errors in the study and evaluation of early Soviet literature.

---

[1] See Chapter IV, p. 86 of this study.
[2] L. N. Smirnova, "Kak sozdavalsia 'Tsement'", p. 225.

Bibliography

Austin, P.M., "Further Surgery of Erenburg's 'Xulio Xurenito'", The Slavic and East European Journal, XI (1967), No. 2, pp. 204-208.

Bowers, Fredson, Textual & Literary Criticism. Cambridge: The University Press, 1959.

Carden, Patricia, "Ornamentalism and Modernism", Russian Modernism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976, pp. 47-64.

Dearing, V. A., A Manual of Textual Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.

El'iashevich, A., "'Bronepoezd 14-69' v svete sovremennykh literaturnykh sporov", Zvezda, No. 2 (1975), pp. 190-209.

Erlich, Victor, Russian Formalism: History - Doctrine. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Friedberg, Maurice, "New Editions of Soviet Belles-Lettres: A Study in Politics and Palimpsests", American Slavic and East European Review, 13 (1954), pp. 72-88.

---------- "Soviet Literature and Retroactive Truth", Problems of Communism, 3 (January-Febraury 1954), pp. 31-39.

Gladkov, F., "Tsement", Krasnaia Nov', Nos. 1-6 (1925).

---------- Tsement. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967.

Gladkovskaia, L., Put' iskanii. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1973.

Ivanov, Vsevolod, "Bronepoezd 14-69", Krasnaia Nov', 1 (1922), pp. 75-124.

---------- "Bronepoezd 14-69", Partizanskie povesti, Moskva-Leningrad: Goslitizdat, 1935, pp. 7-80.

---------- "Bronepoezd 14-69", Vsevolod Ivanov, Povesti, rasskazy, vospominaniia. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1952, pp. 5-85.

---------- "Bronepoezd 14-69", Izbrannye sochineniia Vol. I. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1954, pp. 9-82.

Ivanov, Vsevolod, Bronepoezd 14-69. Moskva: Detgiz, 1957.

---------- "Bronepoezd 14-69", Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958, pp. 547-709.

---------- "Bronepoezd 14-69", Izbrannye proizvedeniia Vol. II. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1968, pp. 63-137.

---------- "Golubye peski", Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958, pp. 326-546.

---------- "Kak sozdaiutsia kurgany", A Bilingual Collection of Russian Short Stories Vol. II. New York: Random House, 1965, pp. 321-342.

---------- "Litera T", Sobranie sochinenii Vol. II. Moskva: Kudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958, pp. 477-486.

---------- "Partizany", Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958, pp. 192-191.

---------- "Perepiska s A. M. Gor'kim", Iz dnevnikov i zapisnykh knizhek. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1964.

---------- Sobranie sochinenii Vol. VIII. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958.

---------- "Tsvetnye vetra", Sobranie sochinenii Vol. I. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958, pp. 192-325.

Kern, G., "Solzhenicyn's Self-censorship: the Canonical Text of 'Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha'", The Slavic and East European Journal, 20 (1976), No. 4, pp. 421-436.

Lakshin, V., "Ot rukopisi - k knige", Novyi Mir, 2 (1969), pp. 247-252.

Leonov, Leonid, Vor. Moskva: Gosizdat, 1928.

---------- Vor. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1970.

Lezhnev, A. Z., "Vsevolod Ivanov", Literaturnye budni. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Federatsiia, 1929, pp. 270-274.

Maas, Paul, Textual Criticism. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Mathewson, R. W., The Positive Hero in Russian Literature. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Minokin, M. V., "O rannem variante povesti Vs. Ivanova 'Bronepoezd 14-69'", Russkaia literatura, 1 (1970), pp. 153-157.

Neverov, A., "V krugu zakoldovannom - Vsevolod Ivanov", Korabl' 1-2 (1923), pp. 32-33.

Olson, P. A., ed., Russian Formalist Criticism. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Reformatsky, A. A., "An Essay on the Analysis of the Composition of the Novella", Russian Formalism. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973, pp. 85-100.

Shklovsky, Viktor, "Iskusstvo kak priem", Michigan Slavic Materials--Readings in Russian Poetics No. 2. Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, 1971, pp. 1-17.

---------- "Ornamental'naia proza', O teorii prozy. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Federatsiia, 1929, pp. 210-224.

Smirnova, L. N., "Kak sozdavalsia 'Tsement'", Tekstologiia proizvedenii sovetskoi literatury--voprosy tekstologii, Vypusk 4. Moskva: Nauka, 1967, pp. 140-225.

Struve, Gleb, Soviet Russian Literature 1917-50. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951.

Tertz, Abram, On Socialist Realism. New York: Random House, 1960.

Thorpe, James, Principles of Textual Criticism. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1972.

Velikaia, N. I., "Povest' Vs. Ivanova 'Bronepoezd 14-69' i problema mirovozzrenia, khudozhestvennogo metoda i stilia", Vsevolod Ivanov. Omsk: Omskii Gosudarstvennyi Pedagogischeskii Institut im. A. M. Gor'kogo, 1970, pp. 51-70.

Vinogradov, V., "O zadachakh stylistiki", Michigan Slavic Materials--Readings in Russian Poetics No. 2. Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, 1971, pp. 29-44.

Zagradka, M., "Zdenek Nejedly i sovetskaia literatura 20-kh godov", Russkaia literatura 4 (1953), pp. 222-229.

Zavalishin, V., Early Sovier Writers. New York: Praeger,

1958.